DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 397 436 CS 215 405

TITLE	Proceedings of the Annual Conference of the Association of Teachers of English Grammar (4th, Williamsport, PA, June 25-26, 1993).
INSTITUTION	National Council of Teachers of English, Urbana, IL. Assembly for the Teaching of English Grammar.
PUB DATE	Jun 93
NOTE	87p.; For Proceedings 1990-1995, see CS 215 403-408.
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - General (020)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	College Students; *Editing; Elementary Secondary Education; English (Second Language); *English Instruction; *Grammar; Higher Education; Sentence Structure; *Student Attitudes; Student Empowerment; *Teacher Attitudes; *Teaching Methods
IDENTIFIERS	*Educational Issues

ABSTRACT

This proceedings contains papers presented at the fourth Annual Conference of the Association of Teachers of English Grammar. Papers in the proceedings are: "Linguistics and English Language Teaching: Another Attempt" (James Kenkel and Robert Yates); "College Students' Attitudes on Grammar--A Survey" (Cornelia Paraskevas); "A Middle Level Language Arts/Grammar Unit" (Alyce Hunter); "Editing: The Key to Teaching Grammar" (Tina Lesher); "Form-Function Parsing: Exploring the Structure of a Sentence without Diagramming It" (Wanda Van Goor and Bill Mullinix); "Empowering the Student with a Grammatical Vocabulary" (Ellin Ronee Pollachek); "It's Elementary, My Dear Students (or Is It?): Selected Teachers' Perceptions on Grammar's Role in the Elementary School" (Melissa Whiting); "The Realities of Seventh and Eighth Grade Grammar instruction" (Mary Beth Voda); "Students' Rights to Their Own Language Revisited: An Attitude Survey" (Terry Lynn Irons); "Grammar in the Middle: Teaching Junior High and Middle School" (Janice Neuleib); "The Role of Pedagogical Grammar in English as a Second Language Instruction" (John P. Milon); and "Unplugging Drill and Practice: Alternatives for Teaching Style, Fluency, and Grammar" (Neal Lerner). (RS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 397 436

Proceedings of the 4th Annual Conference of the Association for the Teaching of English Grammar

June 25 and 26, 1993

Professional Development Center
Pennsylvania College of Technology
Williamsport, PA

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
M. Kallen
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

CS215405

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Contents

Linguistics and English Language Teaching: Another Attempt 1
James Kenkel and Robert Yates

College Students' Attitudes on Grammar -- A Survey 21
Cornelia Paraskevas

A Middle Level Language Arts/Grammar Unit 31
Alyce Hunter

Editing: The Key to Teaching Grammar 33
Tina Lesher

Form-Function Parsing: Exploring the Structure of a Sentence Without Diagramming It 41
Wanda Van Goor and Bill Mullinix

Empowering the Student with a Grammatical Vocabulary 45
Ellin Ronee Pollachek

It's Elementary, My Dear Students (*or is it?*) Selected Teachers' Perceptions on Grammar's Role in the Elementary School 51
Melissa Whiting

The Realities of Seventh and Eighth Grade Grammar Instruction 57
Mary Beth Voda

Students' Rights to Their Own Language Revisited: An Attitude Survey 63
Terry Lynn Irons

Grammar in the Middle: Teaching Junior High and Middle School 73
Janice Neuleib

The Role of Pedagogical Grammar in English as a Second Language Instruction 77
John P. Milon

Unplugging Drill and Practice: Alternatives for Teaching Style, Fluency, and Grammar 81
Neal Lerner

Addresses 91

Linguistics and English Language Teaching: Another Attempt

Jim Kenkel and Robert Yates

Introduction[1]

To decide what grammatical concepts should be taught in schools requires us to consider whether to choose a linguistic or traditional grammatical framework. During the 1950s and 1960s, structuralist linguistics challenged the leadership of traditional English studies in English language teaching, particularly the teaching of writing. In 1960 Paul Roberts, a linguist and author of several texts on the grammar of English, began an article in *College English* with the following: "It is probably fair to say that linguistics is the hottest topic on the English teacher's agenda at the present time." Looking back on this debate of thirty years ago, it is obvious that linguistics lost. This paper explores that debate and why linguistics lost.

We are aware of two other papers, Crowley (1989) and Connors (1986) on the relationship of linguistics to teaching writing. Crowley (1989), the more recent, considers attempts from the 1950s to the 1980s to apply linguistic concepts to the teaching of grammar, style, and discourse structure. We find that Crowley's analysis of the inadequacy of linguistics to help composition teachers teach stylistics and discourse structure to be correct. She cites the relevant assumptions about linguistics which led to suggestions that insights from linguistic knowledge could improve the style of student writing and provide a better understanding of the structure of discourse. However, Crowley's discussion of linguistics and grammar teaching is incomplete. She does not make clear that it was the major theoretical assumptions of structuralist linguistics that led to its rejection by English language teachers. Connors (1986), although very briefly, does provide a flavor of the 1950s and 1960s debate over the role of linguistics in teaching English. Unfortunately, he's inaccurate. He suggests that structuralist linguistics lost the debate because the theory used by the popularizers of linguistics was changing, reflecting the influence of transformational grammar. That is not the complete story.

It is our goal in this paper to explain why the linguistic analysis that the structuralists were proposing to replace traditional grammar distinctions was rejected by English language teachers. We will suggest that the linguistic theory which replaced structuralism, transformational-generative grammar, does indeed provide important insights into teaching grammar, but that its initial influence on English language teaching was based on a serious misunderstanding of transformationalists' goals. Finally, we will cite some recent attempts to apply linguistic insights appropriately to the teaching of grammar.

The Structuralist Position

As early as 1926, C.C. Fries pointed out that pedagogical strategies for the teaching of grammar had not kept pace with the dramatic developments in linguistic science of the preceding 100 years. In fact, the teaching of English grammar had remained largely unchanged since the late 18th century. In 1952, 24 years later, Fries again noted, in his

---

Jim Kenkel is on the faculty at Eastern Kentucky University.

Robert Yates is on the faculty at Missouri State University.

---

introduction to *The Structure of English*, that although advances in the study of langauge had obliged linguists to abandon old views, the English grammar teacher remained insulated from change:

> ... the cultural lag in assimilating the results of this modern scientific study of language has been so great that the views and practices of a pre-scientific era still dominate the schools. (1952, p. 1)

In a rhetorical move which outraged proponents of traditional grammar, Fries even compared the obstinate adherence to "primitive" pedagogical strategies to the widespread advocacy of bleeding by physicians up to two centuries after the publication of Harvey's work on the circulation system in 1628. The negative consequences of this unwillingness to embrace scienctific progress was underscored by Fries' observation that George Washington's death was hastened by the unwise decisions of his physicians to bleed him.

Fries' publication of *The Structure of English* was an attempt to have grammar teaching practices brought into line with contemporary linguistic theory. With this view, Fries addressed his book to educated lay readers interested in the use of English, namely, teachers. Fries hoped that his grammar would serve as an accessible reference that would provide a source for pedagogical theorists and materials developers so that the teaching of grammar would finally reflect linguistic insights.

In retrospect, we know that Fries' efforts were largely unsuccessful. However, his proposal was taken so seriously by proponents and opponents alike that it occupied center stage in English language teaching for more than a decade.

Francis (1953) echoed Fries' call for a linguistic approach to grammar teaching. But whereas Fries was polite and restrained, albeit suggestive, in his description of the stubbornness of traditionalists, Francis was openly contemptuous, charging traditionalists with ignoring their professional responsibility by turning their backs on developments in linguistics. Francis pointed out that our culture linguistics is unique among the sciences in that progress in linguistics is openly rejected in favor of retention of traditional understandings. Linguists, Francis observes, are pejoratively labeled "liberals," which Francis believed was a polite term for "crackpot" (p. 329). That Francis was so indignant is understandable in light of the fact that structuralist linguistics at the time was a very confident field of study. Newmeyer (1986), in his history of linguistic theory in America, notes that in the mid 1950s structural linguistics felt that "the fundamental problems of linguistic analysis had been solved and that all that was left was to fill in the details" (p. 1).

Nevertheless, for all of his indignation and anger, Francis did not concretely advance Fries' agenda of developing methodologies and materials for teaching grammar from a structuralist perspective. Instead, he urged language arts teachers to fill in the gaps in their knowledge either by reading structuralist classics such as Bloomfield's *Language* or Harris' *Methods in Structural Linguistics* or by taking additional course work in linguistics. Apparently, Francis believed that once ignorance was removed, then teachers would willingly abandon traditional grammar and prescriptivism while simultaneously developing new methods and materials rooted in the realities of English and its use as described by structuralists.

Roberts (1956) was a strong affirmative response to Fries' call for a more "scientifically," i.e., structuralist, oriented classroom grammar. Roberts (p. 1) noted that his text "was an attempt to work out a method of teaching the English language

according to the principles of linguistic science." In fact, his grammar relied heavily on Fries (1952) for its morphology and syntax.

Roberts' text was conservative in that it made no claims that structuralist linguistics could have applications to the teaching of language skills beyond classroom grammar. He believed that the study of his grammar would lead to student improvement in writing (p. 14), but he did not characterize what the causal connection might be. Roberts assumed that students working through his book would also be working on the improvement of their writing skills, but he ventured no suggestions on writing pedagogy other than not marking the themes of weaker students as over-correction could inhibit the development of fluency. Thus, Roberts did not claim that structuralist linguistics was the key to solving the problems in the English language classroom beyond the teaching of grammar.

However, structuralist methodologies for the development of language skills were proposed by other linguists. Full of confidence in the validity of their theory and certain that student writing problems could be solved if only students understood the structure of the language, Smith (1959) and Warfel (1959) made enthusiastic and concrete proposals for the application of structuralist theory and method, not only to the teaching of grammar but also to English language teaching in general.

Unfortunately, in spite of both the good intentions of structuralists and their confidence in their theory, it was the inherent limitations of structuralism itself that made them unable to address effectively the problems faced by English language teachers. Structuralist theory rested on three basic assumptions. First the goal of structural linguistics was to describe language and to do so from a radical empirical perspective. Given their commitment to empericism, to describe language, structuralists set up a series of operations, or discovery procedures. These operations were performed on language data, and the results led to the identification of contrasts on the basis of which were established the relevant units of structure, such as phonemes, morphemes, and functional sentence slots. On each level of language, discovery procedures were used to establish the units of structure at that level. Because language is primarily sound, structuralist analysis started with the pronunciation of the language to identify the phonemes. These units of structure were then incorporated into an analysis which identified morphemes, which, in turn, were used to identify functional sentence slots.

It is important to emphasize that these units of structureal analysis were artifacts of the analysis. That is, they were not in any sense considered representations of *a priori* units of grammar. For this reason, from a teaching perspective, students could not be assumed to have any prior knowledge of structure. Like the linguist, they had to learn what the structure was by applying the discovery procedures to data.

A related assumption[2] was that language structure was organized in a strict hierarchy of phonological, morphological, syntactic, and discourse/meaning levels. Structure on higher levels derived directly from the structure on lower levels. It was, therefore, anathema to structuralists to use meaning or discourse phenomena to explain syntactic structure. Thus, as a structuralist, the only help a structuralist methodologist could offer to the English writing teacher concerned with his student's performance was to recommend increased practice of sentence patterns — or even practice of patterns on lower levels of structure, on the assumption that clear structure on the discourse level depended directly on mastery of syntactic structure. But most writing teachers know that this is a false assumption.

The third major assumption[3] of structuralism was that knowledge of language

was a complex set of habits. To the extent that structuralists were concerned with language acquisition, they assumed that a behaviorist framework accounted for it.[4] Since language knowledge was described in terms of acquired habits, it followed that errors in writing were reflections of bad habits, which had to be broken by, and avoided through, persistent practice of the appropriate behavior. However, English teachers were not just interested in the breaking of old structural habits and the formation of new ones; they were interested in the development of both new syntactic behavior and new ideas in their students. But the structuralists were never able to demonstrate a connection between knowledge of sentence structure and the ability to use language skillfully. What structuralists offered to teachers, for instance, was advice to practice common speech patterns, believing that, once good habits were firmly established, problems on the next level of language structure would somehow resolve themselves. Thus, writing teachers were asked to take up the bizarre teaching strategy of obliging students to practice what they already knew in the hope that creative, skilled language use would follow.

These inherent limitations of structuralism made pedagogies it inspired impractical for English language teachers. A careful analysis of Smith's and Warfel's proposals makes these problems clear.

Smith explicitly claimed that knowledge of structure was the key to successful language arts pedagogy.

> I have been much interested and professionally preoccupied with the application of the results of linguistic research to the teaching of English throughout our educational system.... My experience has convinced me that at the basis of all really successful pedagogy in [language arts] is a knowledge of linguistic structure.[5] (p. 174)

According to Smith, if students were to be skilled language users, they must have clear knowledge of language structure. The question for the teacher, then, was how to help students acquire this knowledge.

To teach structure, Smith advocated an unwavering application of the structuralist claims about language, namely, the claims that language was organized in a strict hierarchy with the phonology at its base and that knowledge of language was best described as a complex set of habits which were more or less completely acquired by the age of 6.

Smith's pedagogical suggestions arose directly from these two assumptions. Since knowledge of language consists of a set of habits, then errors in language use must necessarily reflect the earlier formation of faulty habits. Furthermore, since structure is ultimately rooted in the phonology, the best way to develop appropriate habits in students is to offer them instruction in the phonological structure of English.

As an illustration of the kind of knowledge that teachers need and that students must have to improve skills in the language arts, Smith demonstrated how the phonological phenomena of stress and internal juncture "enter into patterns on the higher levels of the linguistic structure" (p. 175). Different levels of stress distinguish the following phrases (where bold faced print = primary stress, italics = secondary stress, underlined = tertiary stress, and "unmarked" = weak stress).

1. **Light** + <u>house</u> + *keeper* = keeper of a lighthouse
2. <u>Light</u> + **house** + keeper = one who does light house keeping
3. *Light* + **house** + <u>keeper</u> = a house keeper light in weight

4. A *new* + **Yorker** is not a <u>New</u> + **Yorker**
5. <u>Long</u> + **Island** is a *long* island

In addition, Smith illustrated internal junction in phrases.

6. **nitrate** vs. **night** + <u>rate</u>

For Smith, the combination of stresses and junctions "is the very blood and bone of English grammar" (176). Not only does description of stress and juncture explain the syntax of phrases, it also allows for classification of uninflectable words. To do this, it is necessary to distinguish between phrasal "constructions," which contain a primary and secondary stress, and phrasal "constructs," which contain a primary stress but never a secondary stress. (7) and (8) below are "constructions" while (9) and (10) are "constructs."

7. *good* + **boy**
8. *John* + **ran**
9. **up** + <u>set</u>
10. <u>up</u> + **set**

Constructions and constructs can embed in each other and the structure of these phrases can be discovered. Take for example (11) below.

11. a *new* **air** <u>raid warden</u> *post*

The discovery procedure initially directs the analyst to the first internal construct and to identify it as a unit; then the analyst moves mechanically through to the end of the phrase. In (11), the first construct (i.e., the first pair with no secondary stress) is "**air** + <u>raid</u>." This unit is combined with the next word, "<u>warden</u>," which has a tertiary stress. The resulting unit is given in (12).

12. [(**air** + <u>raid</u>) + <u>warden</u>]

(12) is a construct, having a primary and a tertiary stress. This unit is then combined with the next word, "post," to yield the construction given in (13).

13. [[(air + <u>raid</u>) + <u>warden</u>] + *post]*

(13) is a construction because it has a primary and a secondary stress. Now the procedure directs the analyst to the front of the phrase, where the word "new" with its secondary stress is combined to (13) to yield the constructions given in (14).

14. [*new*[[(**air** + <u>raid</u>) + <u>warden</u>] + *post*]]

Finally (14) is combined with "a," which has weak stress, to yield the construct given in (15).

15. [a[*new*[[(**air** + <u>raid</u>) + <u>warden</u>] + *post*]]]

In this fashion the grammar of the phrase can be described with no recourse to meaning. The syntax of the phrase is determined by the phonology.

This same procedure can be used to classify uninflectable words, such as "up" in (16) and (17) below.

16. <u>up</u> **stairs**
17. *went* **up**

If "up" occurs in a construct (i.e., that is, a phrase having no secondary stress), then it is a preposition, as in (16). If it occurs in a construction (i.e., a phrase having a secondary stress), then it is an adverb, as in (17). Once again, phonological phenomena rather than meaning have been used to classify these words.

In proposing this framework, Smith claimed the phonological phenomena of stress and juncture are indispensable tools for the description of sentence grammar. He claimed

that nouns and verbs always combine as constructions, and adjectives and adverbs always appear in constructions. Pronouns, articles, conjunctions, and the verb "be" tend to appear in constructs.

This lengthy illustration from Smith reflects very clearly the structuralist belief that language is rooted in speech and that higher levels of language structure have their roots in the phonological structure. As Smith said,

> ... syntax is dependent on phonology; or — to put it another way — just in so far as our phonology is incompletely understood, analyzed, and inventoried, so will our understanding of the composition of words, phrases, constructions, and sentences be incomplete. Not only will it be incomplete, but we will be forced to use criteria from discourse to make statements on the level of syntax.[6] (p. 177)

Smith's last statement arose from the structuralist quarrel with the recourse of traditional grammar to meaning as a way to explain morphological and syntactic structure. As noted earlier, for the structuralists, explanations of phenomena on one level of structure cannot be found in higher structural levels. This assumption about the hierarchical organization of the different kinds of linguistic structure was behind the structuralist contention that the teaching of traditional grammar was itself one of the causes of the lack of improvement in student writing. Because most traditional grammar explanations are meaning based, attempts to explain sentence structure errors in student writing in terms of meaning — a higher level of linguistic structure than syntax — would necessarily be wrongheaded and would confuse the student. For this reason, structuralists argued that traditional grammar be discarded.

Warfel (1959) also took on the problem of laying out the relations between structural linguistics and improving language skills. Like Smith, Warfel believed that successful English language pedagogy necessarily had its roots in insights offered by structuralism:

> Language as an instrument embodies within itself the scientific principles from which the philosophy and psychology of its use can be abstracted. Since rhetoric and logic must work within the framework of language, it would seem almost a truism that a composition teacher should know these laws and formulate his didactic procedures upon them. (p. 209)

Warfel rested his pedagogical suggestions on an analogy between an infant learning to speak and a school aged child learning to write. He maintained that these processes are parallel. Warfel claimed that a child learns speech from her parents, who, during the first three years of her life, work intensely to help her "develop fluency and phonemic accuracy" (p. 209). At age three, the child begins gradually to depend less on her parents for language learning and interacts more with other children. With these children, the child has extensive practice of what she learned from her parents.

The schools, according to Warfel, needed to establish a parallel social structure in the writing curriculum. First, the child learning to write must have the langauge system made conscious to her — just as her parents did for her up to age 3. As parents help their children achieve "fluency and phonemic accuracy" so should the schools promote mastery over simple sentence patterns by demanding intensive imitative pattern practice. Vocabulary teaching is relatively

unimportant for, as Warfel claimed, "No student lacks words; he lacks experience putting the words he knows into patterns" (p. 212). Thus, Warfel dismissed, although presenting no evidence, one of the principal traditional teaching strategies for writing improvement — intensive vocabulary building. Presumably, the student's vocabulary will grow adequately with experience just as a child's spoken vocabulary grows through her social interaction.

Instead of vocabulary, Warfel advocated intensive imitative pattern practice so that the young student will become more aware of the structures needed to pursue her rhetorical and logical aims. Warfel appears to have organized his structural syllabus according to the principle of most frequently occurring structures first to least frequently occurring last. The basic patterns taught, then, would start with the noun functions and move through adjectives to verbs and adverbs.

Warfel observed that the noun form class dominates English sentence structure.[7] Nouns have many sentence functions: subject, object, complement, object of a preposition, etc. Since they occur with such frequency, writing instruction should start with them. Since subjects are the most common noun sentence function, classroom focus should first be on them. Once the student had mastered production of simple noun forms, then this position could be expanded by adding determiners and pre-modifying adjectives. Once these were controlled, then the teacher could add post-modifying prepositional phrases and clauses. After the nominal function had been mastered, the student could begin moving through the rest of the syllabus, engaging in intensive imitative pattern practice as she went.

Because of the assumption that all aspects of rhetoric must be rooted in structure, even style was to be taught through imitative pattern practice. Warfel (dubiously) claimed:

> Although the purpose of pattern practice is not to teach students to parse, no small amount of classroom excitement is possible when stylistic values are explained in terms of syntax. (p. 211)

An important advantage of this kind of structural approach, according to Warfel, was that it provided teachers with a more clearly defined subject matter than did vocabulary building and concomitant discussions of levels of usage. The writing class now had clear objectives — intensive practice of English structural patterns that were essential for the production of sophisticated discourse, which would naturally develop along with the student's mastery of the structures.

The Traditional Response

Predictably, neither Warfel's nor Smith's proposal impressed English teachers. Smith's emphasis on stress as an explanation of structure would have been dismissed out of hand by the vast majority of teachers who properly saw that valuable class time in a writing course needed to be spent on developing writing skills rather than on phonology. On these grounds, Renoir (1961) opposed the structuralist program for writing classes because instructors would have to give "an unconscionable amount of time to linguistic matters not immediately relevant to composition" (p. 486-487). Long (1962, p. 104) also felt that there was not room for phonology in an English skills course. In fact, he considered it to be outside grammar proper, which he took to be morphology and syntax. Furthermore, Smith's method was immensely impractical because it assumed that it was easy to describe the stress in English words correctly. In fact, there would

certainly have been widespread disagreement and confusion over appropriate stress assignment. Stress levels are certainly not reliably identified by untrained ears.[8] Moreover, as Laird (1962) suggested, the considerable phonemic variation in the English speech community renders the phonemic system unsuitable as a base for describing structure in the classroom. Finally, Smith's proposal, although it may have helped in the grammatical classification of uninflected words, wouldn't have helped students learn phrase structure. Certainly, no native speaker is going to have any problem understanding or producing any of the phrases Smith used as examples. Teachers had to have perceived Smith's proposal as unworkable and unnecessary. Few, if any teachers, let alone students, would laboriously assign to each word in a structure one of the four levels of stress in order then to work the combining procedure for the purpose of uncovering phrase structures that they already flawlessly produced. What English teachers wanted from linguists was not elaborate operations for the description of structure but rather help in improving language skills.

For similar reasons, Warfel's approach was also not likely to impress English teachers. Teachers know that native speaking students do not have difficulty in forming the basic structures that Warfel wanted to drill. That they do not should not be surprising given the fact that these patterns were common speech patterns (following the structuralist dogma that speech is primary over writing). It was unclear to teachers how such practice would lead to improvement in writing skills.[9] Moreover, if studies of vocabulary were not able to motivate students, it is unlikely that students would have been stimulated by imitative practice of familiar patterns. Finally, Warfel, as a committed structuralist, assumed but presented no evidence that there was a dependent relationship between syntactic structure and the higher level of structure — meaningful discourse. Teachers could not be expected to engage in such apparently counter-productive practices without strong evidence that this methodology would help students.

Certainly, it is in this questionable relationship between knowledge of linguistic structure and improved writing skills that the structuralist proposal was challenged. Austin (1960) and Howard (1960), both in reply to Warfel's article, argued that a structuralist inspired pedagogy would not help students create meaning. Austin suggested that students must think clearly before they can write effective structures. That is, there is no guarantee that the practiced sentence patterns will be appropriate to the writer's thinking. Austin insisted on distinguishing between knowledge of language and its use. As he pointed out, it might be true that a 6 year old child had mastered speech, but it was certainly the case that even most college students had not "mastered the composition of a speech" (p. 291).

Howard (p. 292) criticized Warfel's reliance on behaviorist inspired techniques of repetition and drill. In the classroom, "the methods of infantile learning are out of place where neither infants nor infantile subjects are taught" (p. 292). Warfel's insistence on pattern practice suggested that meaning and relevance cannot or should not be taught. Howard charged that "the implication is inescapable that pattern perfection is the ultimate goal and that vacuity is its concomitant" (p. 292).

Apart from their immediate relevance to teachers, these critiques of structuralist-inspired methodology are significant because they are reactions against the very assumptions structuralists were making about language and language learning. Austin, in effect, denied the claim that there existed a deterministic relation between syntax and meaningful discourse while Howard disputed

the suitability of behaviorist inspired methodologies for improving communications skills.

Another limitation on the influence of linguists on teachers was that linguists in general were so sure of the validity of their approach that they felt free to ignore the sensibilities of the group they were trying to influence, viz., English teachers. Bowden (1961) noted that the strong behaviorism which characterized structuralist theories of knowledge of language was guaranteed to alienate English teachers.

> The ordinary English teacher ... is a humanist by inclination and training. This does not mean that his attitude is anti-scientific, but it is antibehaviorist. He is committed to a faith in man's moral, political, and intellectual autonomy; and his subject matter includes not only what *is* but what he thinks *ought to be*. To change this quality in him would literally uncreate him; and that would be a pity, because his influence is beneficial, by and large. (483-484)

Bowden believed linguists were interested in improving literacy skills, but he implied that they would have little influence until they better recognized the situation of those charged with this task.

In a similar vein, Renoir (1961), although willing to concede that structural linguistics was a significant field of study, believed that advocates of the structural approach to English composition did not recognize that structuralist method had no direct relationship to the teaching of writing. Renoir also hesitated before the behaviorist bent of structuralism:

> The achievements [of structuralism], however, belong in large part to the province of the behavioral sciences, and the price the humanist must pay for their benefits at the present time — the diminution of the time given to composition and the relinquishing of traditional means of cultural and historical relationship — seems much too high .... (p. 488)

Other traditionalists were less restrained as they pointed out the inadequacy of structuralism as a tool for the improvement of writing skills. Tibbetts (1960) excoriated the entire structuralist effort in the schools as being both wrong and irresponsible. He noted that the structuralist emphasis on form over content had little to offer the writing teacher trying to develop communication skills in his students. The structuralist emphasis on speech as a basis for language description was misplaced for the same reason. Structuralists argued that teaching materials needed to be based on contemporary speech because of the fact of language change — Fries' (1952) grammar was based largely on a corpus of recorded phone conversations. Tibbetts, however, argued that increased literacy had significantly decreased the rate of language change, and, in any event, whatever change did occur, took place so slowly that it was of little concern for the writing teacher. Tibbetts also made the more serious charge that structuralists, because of their belief that no form of language was superior to another, were so afraid of offending linguistic sensibilities that they hesitated to engage in the demanding work of helping students improve their writing. In fact, Tibbetts believed that linguists' avoidance of value judgements had led to a general permissiveness with regard to standards of good writing. In this same vein, Tibbetts made the outrageous charge that structuralist criticism of traditional grammar was little more than "toadying" (p. 283) to the adolescent immaturities of students, always on the lookout for a reason to avoid disciplined

study. Finally, for Tibbetts, structuralist grammar was irrelevant because traditional grammar was perfectly adequate. The weaknesses found in traditional definitions, according to Tibbetts, were hardly more than "lint-picking philosophical distinctions" (p. 284) which had little to do with teaching students to write. Tibbetts believed that student errors in writing resulted both from an inability to use words precisely and from an inability to think clearly. In other words, bad writers were both sloppy and stupid, unfortunate behaviors resistant to structuralist therapies. What was needed was a heavy dose of discipline, hard work, and respect for authority. Although Tibbetts' objections to structuralist linguistics were themselves problematic, structuralists were not able to reply in any way other than to reiterate their claims — claims which had not been accepted.

For example, Lloyd (1963), co-author with Warfel of a structuralist grammar (Lloyd and Warfel, 1956), writing 3 years after Tibbetts, essentially reaffirmed Warfel's proposal. Lloyd's structuralist inspired proposal of a writing and reading curriculum had two stages. First, children would discover their own common speech patterns; then their patterns would be orally drilled using the full range of pattern practice techniques. Lloyd claimed that this behaviorist strategy would encourage creativity (p. 600).

> Lifting the structural elements of sentences from unselfconscious to conscious production, we can make them felt and understood as a storehouse of structural devices. By games of repetition and drill we may drive these devices below consciousness again, so that they come into the mind automatically and creatively as the child writes. (p. 600)

That is, gradually, these familiar speech patterns could be changed into patterns appropriate for written language. Weak reading skills would also improve, according to Lloyd, once students began automatically recognizing common sentence patterns in their texts.

Thus Lloyd, in his essay, did not respond to the substantive critique of Austin and Howard (not to mention the diatribe of Tibbetts). Instead of arguing for the validity of the two key assumptions of structuralism questioned by Austin and Howard, viz., the deterministic relation between syntax and meaningful discourse and the suitability of behaviorism as a teaching model for higher learning, Lloyd merely mouthed these by now tired structuralist axioms.

With structuralists apparently tongue-tied, traditionalists extended their offensive. Sherwood (1960) made a different kind of attack on structuralist grammar. Whereas Tibbetts criticized it on theoretical grounds, Sherwood attacked it because of the values that he claimed it represented. Traditional grammar, according to Sherwood, "stands for order, logic, and consistency; ... for discipline and self control; ..." He continued by claiming that traditional grammar was best conceived "not as Platonic, dwelling in a realm apart from concrete reality, but as Aristotelian, the 'form' of reality, what reality would be shorn of the anomalous and accidental, what reality at its best tends to be" (p. 276-277). Compared to this enduring monument of civilization, structuralist grammar "stands for democracy; for spontaneity; for self-expression; for permissiveness .... " Moreover, structuralism "represents a linguistic Rousseauism, a belief that man's language is best and most real when most spontaneous and unpremeditated and that it is somehow tainted by the efforts of educational systems to order and regularize it" (p. 277). Clearly, structuralist grammar was at odds with the traditional values of the

academy, which were to encourage careful reflection, not to mention the advocacy of language standardization. That Sherwood saw structuralism as such a threat was revealed by his derogatory characterization of Fries' preference for contemporary spoken language over writing as the basis of grammatical description as "another outbreak of Rousseauism" (p. 277).

Warming up to his task, Sherwood continued on to condemn structuralist grammar as a concession to weaker students attending universities as a result of the democratization of education.

> ... [all levels of education have been inundated] by great mobs of students whom before 1930 no one would have thought of trying to educate beyond the elementary level. Such students naturally had trouble with grammar, just as they had trouble with mathematics and science; and since it would have been undemocratic to suspect them of incapacity, the blame was naturally shifted to the teacher and her traditions. The demand for a grammar for morons was inevitable. (p. 279)

Thus, although Sherwood surprisingly conceded that structuralist grammar was more "rationalistic" in its analyses, it was inappropriate as a school grammar because it was oversimplified in order not to overburden weaker students. In spite of its more "rationalistic" character, this "demogogic" attempt to curry favor with the uneducable masses made structuralist grammar incapable of being the "precise logical instrument" needed for the expression of clear thought. On the other hand, Sherwood believed that traditional grammar, an emblem of clear thought (in spite of all the structuralist counterexamples) and the preserver of our best traditions, was an admirable instrument for the expression of clear thought.

The Structuralist Response

These forceful attacks against structuralism in the schools brought C.C. Fries back into the debate. Evidently fearful that linguistics was in danger of being again marginalized, Fries (1961) tried to re-orient the discussion. First, he emphasized the legitimacy of linguistics as a science, summarizing its important discoveries in the preceding 140 years. However, Fries also cautioned against expecting that linguistics would necessarily provide easy solutions for classroom problems because linguistics was more concerned with knowing than with doing. Fries believed that classroom teachers should not see linguistics as a methodology for teaching but rather as a source of knowledge of language which might shed light on language problems (37). He also distanced himself from those practitioners like Smith, Warfel, and Lloyd who had tried to extend the applications of the insights and methodology of structural linguistics from the teaching of grammar to the teaching of communication skills.

> [One error in application that has been made] are the overly enthusiastic assertions of those with very little direct contact with the productions in linguistic science, who, in the manner of science fiction, imaginatively project the claims for linguistic science far beyond anything that science is at present able to deliver. This linguistic-science fiction helps to stimulate an even more extravagant anti-linguistic-science fiction from those of greater ignorance of the facts who have built up a hideous mask to hide the real face of the linguistic scientist. This

> anti-linguistic-science fiction is doing much to muddy the stream of discussion and thus to help keep away from the teachers the aid they need. (p. 36)

If this very direct statement from Fries was not enough to dampen the enthusiasm of those who were looking to teach language skills using the structuralist inspired methodologies, then Laird's (1962) essay certainly was. In his article, Laird addressed assumptions that a structuralist inspired methodology for the teaching of language skills had to make about language and language teaching and disputed them.

First, structuralists claimed that a scientific approach was the best way to understand language and its use. Laird noted that science is not the best approach to the study of arts like music or dance, and it is unlikely that it is the best way to study language, especially language use, which is more of an art than a science anyway. Second, Laird disputed the claim that a study of sound would provide the most scientific description of language. He pointed out that the primary unit of phonological analysis, the phoneme, was not considered an empirical reality by the structuralists; it was an abstraction. Third, a structuralist methodology claimed that the best way to understand a language was necessarily the best way to learn it. Laird observed that structuralist methods were so complicated that few non-specialists could deal with them. Fourth, advocates of structuralist methodologies claimed that they had enough knowledge about language to develop a sound pedagogy. Laird noted that language theories were currently much disputed by rival camps, including the then emerging generativists. Fifth, structuralists claimed that the study of the grammar of the native language was the best means for improving the use of the language. Laird remarked that there had been great writers who had little experience with grammar study.[10] Moreover, he pointed out that studies had shown that instruction in traditional grammar did not have a positive impact on writing. Certainly, in his remarks, Laird summarized the reservations teachers had with any structuralist pedagogy.

Writing more than a year before Laird, Sledd (1961), a prominent proponent of the popularization of linguistics, recognized that the influence of transformational-generative linguistics made the debate between the traditionalists and the structuralists increasingly irrelevant. Sledd acknowledged and accepted the transformationalist critique of structuralism, saying, "[e]ven a moderate amount of study has showed me that I have made a number of the errors with which [the transformationalists] charge the structuralists" (p. 15). Sledd was concerned, however, that the powerful transformationalist critique would weaken proponents of linguistics in the schools to the point that the opponents of linguistics would be successful in their desire to ignore the discipline altogether. The situation as Sledd described it in 1961 was that the structuralists had passed from being linguistic radicals to being linguistically to the right of the emergent transformationalist left (p. 16).

However, Sledd misanalyzed the situation. Sledd's own acknowledgement of the shortcomings of structuralist linguistics as described by Chomsky and his followers (see Chomsky 1966), and Laird's critique of the structuralist inspired pedagogies indicate that structuralism was indeed becoming increasingly irrelevant in the debate over linguistics in the schools. But, rather than playing the role of right wing foil to Chomskyan radicalism, as Sledd suggested, structuralism was simply less and less a factor. Structuralists, whose goal had always been the popularization of linguistics in the schools, understood that they needed to adopt a transformational-generative framework, as did

Roberts (1962; 1964). Unfortunately the popularizers often distorted generative theory by doing so.

For example, in the proceedings of the summer institute of the NCTE in 1963, Marckwardt, in a talk entitled "The structure and operation of language," claimed:

> I am inclined to doubt that generative grammar and descriptive grammar are necessarily mutually exclusive terms. Certainly many of the descriptivists assumed that their grammars would serve as a guide to those who wanted to produce sentences in the language. The formulation of generative statements assumes a descriptive study. The difference seems to me to be one of emphasis rather than kind. When we speak of transformation, however, we are dealing with a statement about technique rather than purpose.[11] (p. 26)

There are several clear misunderstandings about the difference between structuralism and generative grammar in the above quotation. First, and one that continues in many teacher-training grammars, is that generative grammar is process oriented.[12] However, the term "generate" is used here in the mathematical sense in which a mathematical formula describes a curve. This seems to have been a common misunderstanding. The Commission on the English Curriculum of the NCTE in 1963 found that adequate training of secondary teachers should include "transformational grammar, the process by which complex structures are produced" (Grommon 1963, p. 255).

Because of the misunderstanding of "generate," the popularizers saw in transformational grammar a more effective method for teaching complex sentence structures. As Crowley (1989) observes, the influence of transformational grammar was most felt in the development of the sentence production methodology of sentence combining. This methodology, although it enjoyed considerable popularity, rested on a misconception of the claims of generative grammar regarding linguistic competence. Sentence combining assumed that generative grammar was a psychological model of sentence production, and it saw itself as a methodology which mirrored that ability. In this way, such popularizers of linguistics were continuing the failed efforts of earlier structuralists; that is, they assumed that a theory of language should lead directly to effective methods of teaching language skills. Based as sentence combining was on a mistaken notion of language competence, it is not surprising that it met the same fate as the earlier structuralist methods of imitative pattern practice. Sentence combining, like pattern practice drills, was attacked because its practice separated students from communicative contexts. Just as with earlier structuralist attempts, it was very doubtful that there was any correspondence between skill in sentence combining and written communication skills (Crowley, p. 490).

With the disillusionment with sentence combining, the effort begun by structuralists to find in linguistics the key to improved langauge skills ground to a halt.[13] The proposals of mainstream structuralists as well as the proposals of those who tried to continue the search for linguistically motivated approaches to English language teaching by adopting a framework derived from transformational grammar had been effectively discredited. The new generation of linguists, inspired by Chomsky, was not interested in pedagogical problems. English language teaching either remained the domain of unreformed traditionalists or was taken up by rhetoricians. The development of graduate programs in rhetoric-composition in

the last 20 years is witness to this trend. Linguists have increasingly been marginalized from English teaching because it is felt that they have little to say about communication skills. Indeed, research has shown the failure of attempts to establish direct correspondences between knowledge of language structure and skill in language use.

However, we believe that contemporary linguistics does have a role in the teaching of English language skills.

Why Transformational Grammar is More Effective

We have discussed above why structuralist pedagogical suggestions for English language teaching were not accepted. Their overarching goal was to "discover a grammar by performing a set of operations on a corpus of data" (Newmeyer 1986, p. 7). As we have seen, that goal led some to propose that pedagogy should follow similar procedures. The goal of generative grammar was completely different.

This difference was made clear to the English teaching community in an address by Chomsky to the NCTE convention in 1965 that was printed in *College English* in 1966. In this paper, Chomsky made quite clear that the assumptions of a generative grammar are much different from the assumptions of a descriptive grammar. He defined a "generative grammar" as "a theory of language" which is "a system of rules that determine the deep and surface structures of the language in question, the relation between them, the semantic interpretation of the deep structures and the phonetic interpretation of the surface structures" (p. 593). He contrasted the generative grammar with a "descriptive grammar" that is "an inventory of elements." Accordingly, from the perspective of a descriptive grammar, "Once we have listed the phones, phonemes, etc., we have given a full description of grammatical structure. The grammar is, simply, the collection of these various inventories" (p. 594).

Chomsky then considered the consequences of this difference. From the perspective of a descriptive grammar, "the units [of analysis] are prior to the grammar, which is merely a collection of units." From the generative perspective, "the grammar is logically prior to the units, which are merely the elements that appear at a particular stage in the functioning of grammatical processes." From the perspective of a descriptive grammar, language acquisition appears to be "a process of accretion, marked by growth in the size of inventories, the elements being developed by some sort of analytic or inductive procedures." From the generative perspective,

> The process of language acquisition must be more like that of selecting a particular hypothesis from a restricted class of possible hypotheses, on the basis of limited data .... Once the child has selected a certain grammar, he will "know" whatever is predicted by this selected hypothesis. He will, in other words, know a great deal about sentences to which he has never been exposed. This is, of course, the characteristic fact about human language. (p. 595)

We can also draw consequences from these two grammars for understanding the relationship between standard and non-standard dialects. Take, for example, copula deletion found in Black English Vernacular (BEV). From a descriptive perspective some units appear to be missing in the copula of BEV that are found in standard English.[14] A structuralist analysis would be limited to taking an inventory of the forms of the copula possible in this position, viz., zero copula, the contracted form, and the full form. A

structuralist analysis would be unable to explain the linguistic relationship between these copula forms. In fact, a structuralist analysis would class these three copula forms as three morphemes, as they are neither in complementary distribution nor in free variation — as the copula form is a marker of formality.[15]

A generative perspective allows a completely different analysis. This is explicitly acknowledged by Labov (1972) at the end of his analysis of copula deletion in BEV. First, generative grammar allowed the ability to work out a series of ordered rules between the phonology and other components of the grammar. Labov's claim is that the copula can be deleted in BEV only in those contexts where it can be contracted in standard English, thus relating a phonological rule to a syntactic rule of deletion. Such an analysis was not possible for structuralists due to their strong claim that structural levels could never be mixed. Second, it provided a way to compare dialects of English. As Labov notes:

> [W]e find abundant confirmation of Chomsky's general position that dialects of English are likely to differ from each other more in their surface representation than in their underlying structures. This concept of ordered rules is particularly well designed to discover and display such complex sets of relations in a relatively simple way. (Labov 1972, p. 127)

Without a conception of underlying representation, generalizations about dialectal differences were not even conceivable to the structuralists.

Conclusion

The debate about the role of linguistics in the teaching of English in the 1950s and 1960s has traditionally been cast in terms of which grammar to teach. Hartwell (1985) (and within the space of articles we have been considering, Dykema [1961] also makes very similar distinctions) argues there are five types of grammars:

1. An unconscious system we all have which is not capable of direct study.
2. The linguists' descriptions of grammar 1.
3. The notion that there are rules of usage.
4. The rules found in the school textbooks, prescriptive grammar.
5. The rules used for teaching good style, which includes rules for correct use of subordination.

The debate we have been discussing here is whether grammar (2) or grammar (4) should be taught to students. Hartwell shows how each of these types of grammar are inadequate for teaching.

Nevertheless, whether we like it or not, we English teachers are expected to teach students not to violate the more obvious rules of grammar 4 such as run-ons and fragments and subject-verb agreement. However, we do not believe that this expectation means that we should teach the rules of grammar found in the prescriptive handbooks. Insights from the linguists' grammars and procedures of grammar 2 can help students with the rules of grammar 4. Fortunately, in the 1980s and 1990s we find evidence of this in work by DeBeaugrande (1984), Sedley (1989), Noguchi (1992), Klammer and Schulz (1992), and Kenkel and Yates (1992). This work argues that students having difficulty with understanding prescriptive grammar have grammatical intuitions which can be used to understand those concepts. We can find support for such an assumption from generative grammar.

Hartwell concludes his article by noting that present theorizing about teaching writing is marked by a desire "to take power from the teacher and to give that power to the learner" (p. 127). We believe that using insights from linguistics to teach grammar does exactly that. At the end of his 1966 paper, Chomsky noted:

> Few students are aware of the fact that in their normal, everyday life they are constantly creating new linguistic structures that are immediately understood, despite their novelty, by those to whom they speak or write .... They are never brought to the realization of how amazing an accomplishment this is .... Nor do they acquire any insight into the remarkable intricacy of the grammar that they use unconsciously, even insofar as this system is understood and can be explicitly presented. (p. 595)

Our students have a complex, unconscious knowledge of English. We can empower them by showing how that knowledge is related to the conventions of standard written English.

Finally we wish to note that what we are advocating is in the best tradition of the most tireless linguist who tried to popularize linguistics findings, C.C. Fries. At the conclusion of his cautionary article in 1961 on the uses of insights from structural linguistics, he wrote:

> In my view, it is not the tools and the techniques of linguistic science that should be brought into the classroom; but in some way, the substance of the knowledge and understanding won by linguistic science must be thoroughly assimilated and then used to shed new light upon the problems that arise wherever language is concerned. (p. 37)

Insights from linguistic science can be used to formulate pedagogy for English language teaching.

References

Austin, A. (1960). A reply to Professor Warfel. *College English*, 21(5), 291.

Bowden, W. (1961). "... the way they say it." *College English*, 22(7), 478-484.

Chomsky, N. (1965). *Aspects to a theory of syntax*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Chomsky, N. (1966). The current scene in linguistics. *College English*, 27(8), 587-595.

Connors, R. (1986). Grammar in American college composition: An historical overview. In D. McQuade (ed.) *The territory of language: Linguistics, stylistics and the teaching of composition* (pp. 3-22). Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

Crowley, S. (1989). Linguistics and composition instruction. *Written communication*, 6(4), 480-505.

Dykema, K. (1961). Where our grammar came from. *College English*, 22(7), 455-465.

DeBeaugrande, R. (1984). Forward to the basics. *College composition and communication*, 35(3), 358-67.

Francis, W. (1953). Our responsibility to the English language. *College English*, 14(6), 328-332.

Fries, C.C. (1952). *The structure of English*. New York: Harcourt Brace and World.

Fries, C.C. (1961). Advances in linguistics. *College English*, 23(1), 30-37.

Grommon, A. (ed.) (1963). *The education of teachers of English*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Hartwell, P. (1985). Grammar, grammars, and the teaching of grammar. *College English*, 47(2), 105-127.

Howard, J. (1960). Structural linguistics and composition: A rejoinder. *College English*, 21(5), 291-292.

Kenkel, J. and Yates, R. (1992). Grammatical Competence and the Teaching of Grammar. In Ed Vavra (ed.), *Proceedings of the 3rd annual conference of the Association for the Teaching of English Grammar* (p. 16-25). Williamsport, PA: Association for the Teaching of English Grammar.

Klammer, T. and Schulz M. (1992). *Analyzing English grammar*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Labov, W. (1972). *Language in the inner city: Studies in the Black English Vernacular*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Laird, C. (1962). Structural lingustics. *College English*, 24(2), 93-97.

Lloyd, D. (1963). Structure in language. *College English* 24(8), 598-602.

Lloyd, D. and Warfel, H. (1956). *American English in its cultural setting*. New York: Knopf.

Long, R. (1962). Grammar by breakthrough. *College English*, 24(2), 102-106.

Marckwardt, A. (1963). Implications of language processes for the teacher. In B. Weiss (ed.) *Language, linguistics and school programs* (pp. 29-35). Champaign: NCTE.

Marckwardt, A. (1965). Linguistics issue: An introduction. *College English*, 26(4), 249-254.

Moremberg, M. (1991). *Doing grammar*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Newmeyer, F. (1986). *Linguistic theory in America*. 2nd Ed. Orlando: Academic Press.

Noguchi, R. (1991). *Grammar and the teaching of writing: Limits and possibilities*. Urbana: NCTE.

Renoir, A. (1961). Traditional grammar or structural linguistics: A buyer's point of view. *College English*, 22(7), 484-488.

Roberts, P. (1956). *Patterns of English*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company.

Roberts, P. (1960). The relation of linguistics to the teaching of English, *College English*, 22(1), 1-9.

Roberts, P. (1962). *English Sentences*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World.

Roberts, P. (1964). *English Syntax*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World.

Sedley, D. (1990). *Anatomy of English: An introduction to the structure of American English*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Sherwood, J. (1960. Dr. Kinsey and Professor Fries. *College English*, 21(5), 275-280.

Sledd, J. (1961). A plea for pluralism. *College English*, 23(1), 15-20.

Smith, L. (1959). The teacher and the world of language. *College English*, 20(4), 172-178.

Tibbetts, A. (1960). The case against structural linguistics in composition. *College English*, 21(5), 280-285.

Warfel, H. (1959). Structural linguistics and composition. *College English*, 20(5), 205-213.

Endnotes

1. We thank Dr. Wallace Pretzer, Bowling Green State University, for his comments on an earlier draft of this paper.

2. See Newmeyer (1986, p. 1-15) for discussion of these two assumptions, viz., the radical empiricism of structuralists and the hierarchical organization of language structure.

3. For references relating to this assumption, see citations that follow in our text, especially Smith (1959) and Warfel (1959).

4. To our knowledge, structuralists did not really examine language acquisition. As very pure empiricists, they accepted behaviorist learning theory without any real examination, thinking that research supported it.

5. Smith was, of course, referring to conscious knowledge of structure.

6. Of course, the assumption that levels cannot mix does not account for the possessive "s" inflection which attaches to a phrase structure (i.e., NP), not to an individual word (i.e., N), thus resulting in the mixing of the phonological, morphological, and syntactic levels.

7. This claim is, of course, problematic because it ignores the fact that both the type of NPs and their distribution in a sentence is to a large extent determined by the sub-categorization and the selectional restrictions of the verb.

8. Newmeyer (1986, p. 13-14) cites a prominent structuralist, Archibald Hill, who, as early as 1958, admitted that not all native speakers could perceive the contrasting levels of stress in their speech.

9. However, Laird (1962), an opponent of the structuralist program, conceded that the simple patterns focused on by structural linguistics might "help those morons [emphasis added] who have never learned to write sentences."

10. In this final point, Laird failed to make the distinction between learning to improve the use of language and using language effectively through intuition and unconscious awareness. Laird implied that since some great writers had little experience with grammar study, others should also have "little experience" because, after all, they are "great" already. We thank Wallace Pretzer for this observation.

11. Marckwardt (1965) acknowledged that "generative" and "transformation" are not meant to be interpreted as "process" terms and says, "English teachers have been particularly given to making this mistake, and it has weakened some of their research efforts" (252). However, in the very next paragraph, he discussed texts that had been influenced by generative grammar because "its emphasis upon production [emphasis added] rather than description seems to fit in with the justification of language study in the English curriculum."

12. For example, Sedley (1991, p. 136) offers a disclaimer that her description of relative clauses does not model a process, but then offers a detailed 3 page process description of relative clauses. Morenberg (1991, p. viii) describes grammar as a sentence producing machine. Finally, Klammer and Schulz (1991, p. 235) refer to transformations as "the process by which one sentence can be transformed into another .... "

13. The impact of structuralist linguistics was much greater in TEFL than in English language teaching to native speakers. Structuralist inspired methodology, known as audio-lingualism, was the dominant TEFL methodology until the early 1970s.

14. Some examples from Labov (1972):

1. She the first one started us off.
2. He fast in everything he do.
3. You out of the game.
4. But everybody not black. (p. 67)

15. This analysis of the copula in BEV follows Bloch's (1947) analysis of auxiliary "have," cited by Newmeyer (1986, p. 14). Because of the constraints of structuralist theory, Bloch was reluctantly obliged to class the four forms of "have" as four different morphemes.

College Students' Attitudes on Grammar — A Survey

Cornelia Paraskevas

I've always enjoyed grammatical analysis, from elementary school when I was first introduced to it until now, when I try to explain the intricacies but also the systematic nature of English. I never questioned the usefulness of learning grammar; not only was understanding sentence structure important to writing, but also grammar was an interesting subject by itself, like solving a puzzle — how do all the pieces fit together to create the whole? It was a big shock to me to discover, four years ago when I started teaching grammar, that most of my students did not share my interest or excitement in the subject matter. I heard it informally and I could sense it in the classroom; in fact, a number of students clearly let me know that they considered the class a hoop, another requirement they had to fulfill, and that they couldn't understand the reason behind it; a number of them considered themselves to be good writers ("I always get A's on my papers," they tell me), to have intuitions about their sentence structure, and to be using proper punctuation. In addition, they all believed that since they used Standard English when speaking (which is not always true — I have often heard "I should have went/wrote") there was nothing new to learn about Standard English. So, considering these facts, what was the value of grammar? Furthermore, a number of them were familiar with all the research and statements against teaching grammar: the 1963 research reported in Braddock's book on the connections between grammar and writing and Chomsky's statements on our underlying grammatical competence. These students let me know in no uncertain terms that teaching grammar is an antiquated idea; after all, they've heard this from other teachers.

In order to get a feel for the students' ideas on grammar and their expectations from the class, I always ask them to write brief answers to a few questions. The first questionnaires were rather informal — no tallying numbers, no yes/no questions; the issues I wanted them to explore or to think about as they set out for their grammar voyage were superficially simple: what is grammar, what is the purpose of learning grammar, what are their expectations from the class. I should mention here that I teach two different grammar classes: a basic, lower level grammar class (ENG 215) whose aim, according to the catalogue, is to "teach the students the conventions of Standard Written English" and an advanced grammar class (The Structure of English — ENG 492) whose aim is to familiarize students with the more complex aspects of the structure of English sentences. The lower level class and an introductory linguistics class are both required for 492. Both classes are required for secondary education and English majors, but only the lower division grammar class is required for elementary education students. The survey I conducted this term included students from both classes — a total of 100 students, 75 in lower division classes and 25 in the upper division class; I gave them a questionnaire in the beginning of the term and another one at the end of the term, on the last day of class ; the questionnaires in the beginning of the term asked them the following questions:

-whether the class is required or not

Cornelia Paraskevas is on the faculty at Western Oregon State College.

-whether they enjoyed writing or not
-their definition of grammar
-their expectations

In the beginning of the term, most students believe that grammar is a prescriptive set of rules; last term, I typed all the statements I had heard from other students and then surveyed my class to see how they defined grammar. Out of 25 juniors and seniors in advanced grammar, 17 believed that grammar is a collection of rules that should be followed in order to speak and write properly, and 19 believed that grammar is a collection of principles discovered on the basis of the ways people actually speak and write. Most are quite familiar with prescriptive rules: the split infinitives, never beginning a sentence with a conjunction, never ending with a preposition, never using "I" in academic discourse, and the list goes on. Interestingly enough, most upper division students have taken other language classes where we discuss descriptive vs. prescriptive grammar; however, it seems that as they get closer to receiving their teaching certificate, they begin seeing themselves as purveyors of the purity of English and forgetting the notion of descriptive grammar.

Despite the fact that half of them (12) considered grammar a rather tedious task, most believe that there is a purpose to this knowledge: to help their students with their writing and to be able to teach it to their students (23 out of 25 in advanced grammar and 29 in the basic grammar class ranked this as the most important reason for learning grammar). There is also, however, a utilitarian purpose shared by both upper and lower division classes: learning grammar will keep them from making mistakes in their writing. Both groups of students, in other words, have similar expectations from the class — a quick-fix for punctuation errors, a way to correct their mistakes. In fact, a number of 215 students tell me in the beginning of the term "teach me everything you can about punctuation so that your colleagues will stop giving me bad grades on my papers, marking things such as dangling modifiers or s-v agreement that I do not understand" — grammar is seen as appropriate for remedial purposes. Some of them, the weaker writers as they consider themselves, believe that improving their grammar will automatically result in improved writing, equating good writing with proper mechanics, believing that grammar is the cure-all for bad writing. This contradicts the statement that some good writers make — and which they have heard from others — that grammar instruction does not necessarily improve the quality of writing. It seems that weak writers will look for any "trick" to improve their writing skills — even if that "trick" goes against what the majority of writing instructors currently believe.

All of them are aware of the social value of grammar: incorrect grammar not only results in bad grades, but also stigmatizes them as uneducated; so as college graduates, they know they are expected to use Standard English and that's what most of them, especially the lower division students, want. In addition, there is a fair number of students that actually believe that learning grammar for its own sake can be fun (7 students in advanced grammar and 12 in basic grammar ranked it #6, the lowest rank) — it is an exercise for developing their minds and they enjoy language puzzles. To sum up, then, my students believe grammar should be learned because they'll have to teach it one day, because it has remedial purpose and because there is social stigma attached to its misuse.

Finally, there is a small number of those students in the upper division class — my writers, as I call them — who enjoy writing and have taken classes in creative writing and who believe that grammar and writing are closely connected but not in "utilitarian" or

"remedial" ways: they believe, and rightly so, that understanding sentence structure will improve their style (13 students in advanced grammar). Sue, for example, wrote: "Grammar and punctuation are to me, the writer, what basketball rules and dribbling are to the basketball player. At some point in our lives, we have to be willing to learn the rules so we can play with the professionals." These students have had prior experience with grammar and linguistics, and find language puzzles fascinating and challenging.

Quickly looking over the surveys from both classes (Figs. 1 and 2), we see that correcting their mistakes and teaching grammar are the primary reasons students take the class; in fact, these two were considered the most important reasons in basic grammar; by contrast, the top reasons in the advanced grammar are the ability to control their writing/language and an interest in understanding the more complex aspects of sentence structure.

Such diverse purposes — from teaching them grammar so they can teach it when they receive their teaching certificates, to teaching them correct punctuation, to giving them control of their structure so they can make appropriate choices for a reader-based prose — make my task difficult; at first sight, it appears that my classes consist of students who have separate expectations in mind: one group wants grammar for corrections, while another one wants grammar for style. All of them, however, agree on one point: since they will be required to teach it, they should have a solid knowledge of basic grammar.

However, the gap between the two groups is not that difficult to bridge: all of them need to be able to identify a clause and its constituent parts (subjects, predication, modification); by understanding clauses and their structure, the non-writers will improve in their punctuation skills while the writers will feel more in control of their language — they will have the ability to manipulate the constituent parts of the clause for their own purpose.

The topics covered in the ten short weeks I have to teach them include the following:

> *Basic Grammar*: identifying subjects, verbs and their complements, modification (relative clauses, prepositional phrases, appositives), sentence types, usage (pronouns), punctuation conventions of Standard Written English.
>
> *Advanced*: noun phrases, verbs and verb forms, adverbial and adjectival modification, the distribution of old/new information, ways to change the focus in a sentence.

I based my choice of topics to be covered on the Lunsford list of frequently corrected errors and on the Hairston study of marked errors. As we know, according to those studies, the errors most frequently marked by teachers include no comma after introductory element, vague pronoun reference, no comma in compound sentence or nonrestrictive element, comma splice, tense or person shift, fragments, subject-verb agreement errors, pronoun errors, run-ons, comma errors in series or restrictive elements, dangling modifiers.

The aim is not to teach them how to memorize parts of speech and constructions; rather, it is to teach them the thought process required for grammatical analysis — the step-by-step procedure for figuring out sentence structure. In this way, they become independent learners, they feel more confident because through analysis they can control language, and ultimately, they feel they have obtained the "golden key" to grammar which teachers previously held. In very general terms, teaching the thought process involves learning the criteria for classification of words/phrases into

appropriate categories (syntactic, semantic and discourse) and understanding how the various elements of a sentence work together to create meaning.

At the end of the term, I surveyed the classes to see what topics they found most useful and also to see how they correspond with Lunsford's study of frequently occurring errors (Figs. 3 and 4). The non-writers in 215 find that the most useful topics covered in class are (in order of preference): subjects and verbs (predication), sentence types, run-ons/fragments, dangling modifiers, pronoun usage, dependent clauses, punctuation. This list includes almost all the topics included in the Lunsford/Connors and Hairston studies, appearing, however, in different order; where the most frequently marked error is comma after introductory element, the most useful topic according to my students is identification of clauses; this is not a problem since identifying necessary elements of clauses vs. modification will help them with punctuating introductory, non-clausal elements. Their choice of topics is heavily influenced by what they perceive to be the problem areas in their writing; in fact, when asked how has knowledge of grammar affected their writing, they are quick to point out that they now can punctuate properly, can clearly indicate modification, and can write long sentences since they know how to punctuate them. But in addition to those "utilitarian" results, almost all of them feel that grammar has given them more control over their language, has made them more confident about their writing and has helped them make appropriate choices, knowing how to move elements around in a sentence to place them in focus; this is an "added" bonus as most of them simply expected a "quick" fix to their punctuation problems or a basic theory which they, in turn, can teach to their students.

Their comments at the end of the survey are interesting to read:

> Understanding sentence structure enables me to write clearly thus making the reader's job easier.
>
> Understanding sentence structure gives me flexibility in my writing; it enables me to vary sentence length and type so that my papers don't have the same old thing over and over again.
>
> I have always lacked confidence in my writing, and the more I learn about proper structure, the more confident I become.
>
> I can make my intentions clear and manipulate my words accordingly.
>
> Knowing grammar has made my writing easier and more enjoyable because I find it easier to put thoughts together.
>
> Grammar makes my writing make more sense; it helps my reader follow my train of thought more smoothly.
>
> Knowledge of grammar gives me the means to maneuver within a sentence for clarity in communication.
>
> I notice that now I use more complex sentences and I write with more strength.

Of course there are students who at the end of the term complain that their writing has been ruined, that they cannot freewrite anymore because they constantly think of correctness:

> Grammar has stilted my flow in first drafts; I second-guess myself now.
>
> No matter what it is I'm working on, I am always looking to see whether it's grammatically correct or not — how annoying!

> I stress more now about writing because I'm trying to remember all of the rules.
>
> I actually find it more difficult to write. I am constantly questioning things that I had never questioned before. It takes considerably longer to write a paper.

To those students, my answer is very simple: "You have yet to learn to separate your focus — attending to creating first and then attending to editing and revising." Or, another way of answering their statements, which is what my chairman uses, is to tell them that the cleaner their first draft is, the less editing they will have to do at the final stages of their writing.

The students in upper division classes find, just like the basic grammar students, that the most important topics covered were clauses and their constituent parts (NP's and VP's vs. verbals) — the core of a sentence, in other words, followed by types of dependent clauses, tense/aspect considerations, prepositional phrases. At the end of the term, they all feel rather comfortable with understanding structure and proper punctuation. It is interesting to note that both classes and both types of students (writers and non-writers) find identifying the core of a clause as the most useful topic covered; correcting the punctuation errors noted in the Lunsford and Hairston studies (namely 1, 3, 5, 8, 12, 14, 17, 18, the Very Serious errors, the Serious errors, and the Moderately Serious) correlates with the ability to properly identify the constituent parts — the meat — of a clause. In addition, the writers feel their expectations have been met regarding the effects grammatical knowledge has on their writing:

Jean H.

> Grammar as a way of thinking about language has been a very freeing concept for me. I find myself analyzing a sentence or clause, looking for the reasons I wrote it that way or to discover a better way to say what I want the reader to understand from my writing.

Helen S.

> Since this course started, in both my reading and writing, I have become more aware of grammar and the rhetorical choices that are made by writers, myself included. Having a grammar course at any level is beneficial as it forces writers to manipulate language and to investigate different styles and rhetorical strategies.

Darren S.

> The greatest revelation about my writing was in the section I analyzed from a term paper; I discovered that when writing for a teacher, I tied long, convoluted noun phrases together, linked by simple verbs. The paper earned an "A" from the class it was written for, but it was horribly boring.... I suppose it is only appropriate to close with what I have learned over the last 10 weeks and how my skills as a grammarian have improved: Let me dramatize the difference — before this class, my skills were not much better than grade school level. My problem was that my grammar was correct within my writing; my structure in the past was not poor but was based on instinct. I was guessing by what I felt worked. By getting a solid foundation in grammar and structure, I have something solid to examine and edit my work with, a guide to improving my writing. Grammar has also given me a tool to go back over my work and improve old pieces that never quite worked. When a piece is flat or uninteresting for no apparent reason, I have found that it is quite often simply a matter of poor or simplistic structure. Recognizing this allows me to improve

> my work, revising it at a structural level, texturing and layering the writing, giving it stronger impact and greater reader appeal!

Barbie D.

> Before studying the structure of my language, my writing was a basic flow of ideas onto paper, with conscious effort given only to varying sentence lengths and beginnings only because I had been taught that variety is fresh and pleasing to one's readers. Now, as I have conscious knowledge of grammar, the variety of sentence structures is deliberate. Consciously I am able to construct a sentence which will most effectively emphasize key words, phrases, or ideas. Coupled with knowledge of sentence transformations, knowledge of punctuation is indeed a freeing and empowering element of the writing process. Realization of punctuation as a structural mark rather than a breath-pattern indicator contributed significantly to the control I gained in my writing. Without understanding and knowledge of sentence structure and the influences of punctuation upon that structure, my only option was to rely on my native instinct; now, I can confidently command each mark, using them strategically and appropriately. Grammar is a system which holds our written language together so that the intent and heart of our thoughts and ideas may be truly and clearly expressed.

But there is an added benefit that some students have found; knowing grammar has helped them become better readers:

Sue C.

> Grammar has helped me as a reader. There have been many times since I've grasped grammar on more friendly terms that when I come to a difficult sentence, I don't pass it over any more. I take it apart and make meaning out of it. And reading is directly related to writing. The more I read the more I learn about different styles and the multiple ways of writing, giving me, the writer, more choices. The shift in the attitude of students, from considering grammar just another necessary evil to a tool useful for writing and reading, is the most interesting observation in the survey; I believe that it has come about because the language they have been analyzing has been real language, the one they hear, read, and write daily rather than the drill and fill-in-the-blank sentences most books have; furthermore, learning grammar was learning the thought process, a new way of thinking about the words and phrases that create meaning rather than hunting for *the* correct answer. When grammar is seen in those terms, as analysis of their daily language, its relevance becomes apparent; knowing subjects, predication and modification is important not only for punctuation but for better writing. The surveys conducted in the beginning and the end of the term proved useful not only because they validated my feelings that most students expected in the beginning of the term a quick fix of their grammar problems, but also because at the end of the term, they contained a surprise: all students, regardless of what they believed about grammar or what they expected from the class, found that knowing grammar helped their writing improve through conscious rhetorical choices; through shifting elements around in a sentence to place them in a position of focus, through simple transformations, they can change the rhythm of the sentence and the distribution of old/new information, thus "making the language speak and draw

pictures for the hearers to read and see." Our task then is to show them grammar through real language (rather than fill-in-the-blank worksheets) to make grammatical knowledge connected knowledge for them, to give them the tools to control their language.

Appendix A
Cornelia Paraskevas

Questionnaires

BASIC GRAMMAR: Reasons for Taking the Class

RANK	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
1	7	14	1	1	(16)	2	14
2	11	7	3	3	(8)	2	15
3	9	10	12	3	(8)	3	5
4	11	11	8	6	(7)	0	4
5	6	8	14	10	(3)	5	6
6	4	0	4	21	0	12	1

A) to improve my punctuation
B) to correct the grammatical mistakes I make when I write
C) to be able to have sentence variety when I write
D) understanding sentence structure is interesting
E) understanding sentence structure gives me more control over my language/helps me make appropriate syntactic choices in my writing
F) enjoy analyzing language/solving language puzzles
G) need to understand structure in order to teach it

Fig. 1

ADVANCED GRAMMAR: Reasons for Taking the Class

RANK	A	B	C	D	E	F
1	4	2	1	3	7	7
2	7	5	0	2	3	5
3	3	8	1	4	0	6
4	4	5	6	2	3	3
5	5	3	7	4	2	2
6	0	0	8	7	8	0

A) to understand the most intricate aspects of sentence structure
B) to correct the grammatical mistakes I make when I write
C) to be able to have sentence variety when I write
D) I enjoy analyzing language/solving language puzzles
E) I need to understand sentence structure so I can teach it
F) understanding sentence structure gives me more control over my language/helps me make appropriate syntactic choices in my writing

Fig. 2

Appendix B
Cornelia Paraskevas

Course Content

BASIC GRAMMAR: Topics Covered

RANK	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K
1	22	1	6	10	2	0	7	0	6	0	2
2	7	2	18	6	3	3	5	1	4	0	6
3	6	5	6	11	1	5	5	2	2	1	9
4	7	4	6	6	5	6	4	1	6	0	7
5	4	7	4	6	7	4	8	1	5	2	6

A) Subjects, Verbs, Objects and Complements
B) Prepositional Phrases
C) Sentence Types (CD, CX, CDCX)
D) Correcting Run-ons and Fragments
E) Punctuation of parenthetical expressions
F) Punctuation of appositives
G) Punctuation of relative clauses
H) Punctuation of dates and addresses
I) Pronoun Usage
J) Capitalization
K) Misplaced and Dangling Modifiers

Fig. 3

ADVANCED GRAMMAR: Topics Covered

RANK	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
1	2	1	10	2	2	0	0	7
2	6	0	6	2	1	0	0	7
3	2	4	3	3	7	0	0	4
4	2	3	1	6	7	0	0	5
5	5	8	3	1	1	1	4	

A) Noun Phrases (including Determiners)
B) Prepositional phrases (Adjectival and Adverbial)
C) Verb Types and their Complementation (DO, C, or OC)
D) Tense and Aspect
E) Dependent Clauses (subordinate, relative, noun)
F) Negative sentences
G) Direct and Indirect questions
H) Verb Forms and their properties

Fig. 4

A Middle Level Language Arts/Grammar Unit

Alyce Hunter

I believe that the study of formal grammar with its rules and conventions is appropriate and necessary for middle level learners. Likewise, I believe that all instruction at this level should take into account that middle school students are unique individuals who need developmentally appropriate learning experiences. For example, early adolescents like and learn more through active, constructive activities. Also these students enjoy exploring real-life topics in exhaustive detail and humanizing knowledge. Therefore, I believe that an effective way to teach the beauty and richness of the English language to middle level learners is through experiences that require them to actively participate, thoroughly investigate, and purposefully interact with peers and others.

The grammar unit I developed has as its base a variety of learning and teaching objectives. Learning objectives include studying of word origins and histories, preparing for standardized testing, and understanding the importance of grammatic conventions in everyday life. Cooperative and collaborative experiences to promote reflections upon the conversations about English grammar are appropriate teaching objectives.

Activities to accomplish these objectives focus on the production of tangibles — oral presentations, usage booklets, peer tutoring, etc. — that consider the derivation of "grammar" words (comma, period, noun, verb, etc.), roles for usage in English and other languages, and instances of correct and incorrect grammar. Initially, the class participates in preliminary discussions and tasks that help them realize expectations and participate in the setting of procedures and timelines. Cooperative groups are established and assignments are given.

For example, groups are assigned a standard punctuation mark. They must investigate the mark with regard to its etymology and connected concepts and report their findings to the entire class. Media center cooperation is essential as the learners ponder over how these words came to have their current meanings and usage. Furthermore, learners choose how they would like to present their reports to their peers. Formal speeches, debates, and skits are among their options.

With regard to rules for usage in English and other languages, groups are assigned specific categories, such as the use of commas, to investigate. Participants describe conventions through research and interviews. Then they report their findings to the class. Games, usage booklets, and formally taught lessons are some of the acceptable reporting activities.

Additionally, students consider instances of correct and incorrect usage in their own and their classmates' writing and examples from standardized tests. They develop an action plan that will help eliminate incorrect usage. This plan can include a journal of usage gleaned from advertisements, newspapers, and television, which requires learners to consider exceptions to roles and the differences between speaking and writing. A usage booklet designed for younger learners can also be produced. This activity

Alyce Hunter is Supervisor of Language Arts, Reading and Media Grades K-12 at Franklin Township Schools in Somerset, New Jersey.

requires not only that the investigators know grammar and usage rules but also that they determine inclusions and activities that are appropriate for younger learners.

Considering the variety of learning and teaching objectives, teachers should use both formative and summative evaluations to determine individual and class success with this unit. For example, students should be judged on the quality of their choices of activities for inclusion and method reporting. Additionally, teachers should consider how each team and its members function. Finally, students should be evaluated on how much they taught their peers and on how much they learned from other groups. Possibilities include student made tests, peer performance evaluation, and teacher generated assessments.

Finally, I began developing this middle level language arts/grammar unit when I realized that even the brightest of today's eighth graders have no common grammatical reference from which to consider their own writing and the writings of others. The beauty of a "well-turned" phrase, clause, or sentence is simply something they are ignorant of because their language arts learning has concentrated on literature-based, process oriented objectives. As I reflect upon this unit both as it is recorded in this report and as it was implemented, I realize that I was overly ambitious in my attempt to design language learning experiences that are both usage and grammar oriented. I continue to believe that not only usage but also formal grammar instruction is appropriate and essential for middle level learners and will refine this unit to emphasize grammar teaching and learning so that middle level learners will come to appreciate the delights of the English language.

Editing: The Key to Teaching Grammar

Tina Lesher

In the context of journalistic writing, the copy editor plays an integral role. He represents a detective protecting the language from such abuses as inaccuracies, redundancies, and pompous passages. In his quest to insure clear writing, the editor concentrates on correct spelling and grammar.

Possessing strong grammatical skills remains a necessary component to entering the editorial ranks. When the American Society of Newspaper Editors asked newspaper executives what type of person they would seek for a copy editor's post, Oklahoma editor Marjorie Paxson said: "A person who knows grammar, spelling and pays attention to details." (Baskette, 1986).

The copy editor does not engage in the reporting/writing process per se; he handles articles written by reporters. While journalists recognize the need to be good editors themselves, they are cognizant that evaluating their own work can be problemsome. Berner (1992) notes that "editing your own copy is almost like seeing your own or your children's faults — it is very difficult to be objective."

Reporters often overlook grammatical errors in their copy. When writing coach Barbara King was observed (Lesher, 1988) working with staffers at *The Gloucester (Ma.) Times* in the late 1980s, she had circled comma splices and other errors in stories written by the reporters. Discussion topics at King's weekly sessions often centered on grammar-related issues. Paula LaRocque, writing coach at the *Dallas Morning News*, noted (Lesher, 1986) how reporters' lack of grammar knowledge was playing havoc with their writing. At the 1992 convention of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication (AEJMC), journalism professors complained that they are forced to teach basic grammar in their classes because their reporting students lack knowledge of the basic rules. (Editor and Publisher, August 22, 1992).

In the newsroom, the task of righting the faux pas of reporters falls to the copy editor. As a *New York Times* staffer argued (Gilmore, 1990) in the paper's in-house newsletter: "Every reporter is going to have an occasional lapse in fullest lucidity, and he would like to feel that he is securely backstopped. That, after all, is the copy desk's primary function."

A trained copy editor takes a story and reads it through before making changes. He uses standard copy-editing symbols to correct mistakes, including errors in grammar. According to Brooks and Pinson (1993), publishers prefer traditional grammar because

> It's been around longer and is more widely taught. But mainly because publishers — be they newspaper, magazine, or book companies — require the prescriptive approach of traditional grammar rather than the descriptive approach of structural grammar. Traditional

Dr. Tina Lesher, assistant professor of print journalism at William Paterson College, is an award-winning journalist and accredited public relations counselor. She has taught business and technical writing and has served as a writing consultant for several New Jersey firms. Dr. Lesher received her B.A. degree in history from Wheeling Jesuit College and her M.A. from the University of Missouri School of Journalism. She holds a doctorate in language arts education from Rutgers University.

> grammar says: "This way is the right way."

Editing symbols remain standardized across the publishing spectrum. When an editor uses the symbols to delete mistakes, insert words, or make sentences grammatically correct, those reading the work understand the changes. A published chart (Fedler, 1993) shows the various symbols used by editors (Appendix A).

While some symbols specify changes in accepted style, many are designed to correct grammatical errors. Jane Harrigan (1993) tells copy-editing students that "red lights should be blinking all around you now as you make your way through a story...As you correct grammatical errors, you'll be enhancing the story's accuracy and clarity."

Using symbols provides not only a clear message to typesetters, but it allows the copy editor to work hands-on within a piece of copy. Even with the onset of computerized editing systems, many editors prefer to work on hard copy; sending editing material by FAX, for example, requires such an approach.

Using a dark, thick pencil, the copy editor transposes words or inserts letters at the problem spots. Metz (1991) cites a list of potential deficiencies with which to deal; "bad grammar" tops the chart, followed by misspellings. To the untrained observer, the copy editor's labor appears to be little more than busy work. To the copy editor, however, the work moves quickly and provides the intellectual challenge of making a story perfect.

> Harrigan (1993) points out the need to practice the art of editing: Grammar and usage drills are to the neophyte editor what sketches are to the artist. The more you practice, the more you see .... Most people who are interested in writing can develop an eye for editing. It doesn't require perfection, just effort and a willingness to acknowledge what you don't know. If you've always been a little hazy on commas, find a grammar book and practice until you know where to put them.

Tony Zonca, a seasoned copy editor who "coaches" reporters at *The Reading (Pa.) Times*, conversed with the paper's top columnist on how the latter's work could be strengthened. Lesher (1988) describes the discussion:

> Zonca: (reads sentence which includes the words "advancing age, aching arthritis") You going to leave that in?
>
> Bill: I like it.
>
> Zonca: Arthritis usually aches.
>
> Bill: It does, doesn't it? I was going for alliteration.
>
> Zonca: You know enough to set the tone...now you have to take the step.
>
> Bill: Which is a question of what to leave out...

"Leaving out" translates, too, to ridding copy of dangling participles and misplaced modifiers, to punctuating the story correctly, and to changing mistakes in subject/verb agreement. Students' copy often includes such "fatal flaws." Loretta Shpunt, of Trinity College in Washington, said (Mencher, 1991) that she seriously considered buying a red ink pad and a set of rubber stamps that read:

> Not a Sentence
> "It's" Equals It Is
> "Its" Is Possessive
> Dangling Participle

"I" Before "E" Except After "C"

For journalism students, whose previous grammar training, Mencher argues, has been "inadequate," editing provides a way to concentrate on eliminating mistakes and improving the language. Among the other duties assumed by the copy editor (Harriss et al., 1985) are eliminating verbosity and libelous statements, checking for accuracy, and simplifying prose. Would-be journalists and copy editors become familiar with the standard editing symbols, and use those marks to transpose words, delete incorrect material, or insert language that makes the copy grammatically correct.

But copy editing remains somewhat closeted in the journalism domain; students and professionals in other fields revise their work without the benefit of training in copy editing.

After studying teaching/researching of writing under the tutelage of theorist Janet Emig and others, the author, a former copy editor at *The Philadelphia Inquirer* and *The Hartford Courant*, began to realize that the techniques of copy editing would provide a strong but simple approach to teaching grammar in any writing class. If students adopted the copyreader's mind-set, which focuses on making material accurate, they would assume the duties of finding grammatical errors. By working with various types of stories, the "editors" would uncover mistakes representing a cross-section of the grammar spectrum. Thus, after a period of time, they would be skilled grammarians.

Along the way, the students would gain a bonus: stronger writing skills. Working regularly on improving good and bad articles makes the editor aware of the best approaches to ordering a story.

The author, in a published article (*Coaches' Corner*, December 1991) explains how she integrates grammar instruction into her writing/editing classes:

> I give short editing exercises reflecting the grammatical problems faced by would-be writers. Within a short time, my students confidently allude to serial commas, non-restrictive clauses, etc. They seem to enjoy debating the merits of the semi-colon. Their writing and editing takes on a real challenge...The payoff comes in the work...These students produce stronger journalistic pieces. Many of the comments in their evaluations reflect their gratitude for learning reporting AND grammar.

Drawing on such experiences, the author has transferred the editing approach into other composition contexts. At NEWSCAMP, a summer program she directs for middle and high school students, each day's sessions begin with an editing exercise. Using copy-editing symbols, the enrollers change sentences or entire stories to reflect Associated Press style and proper grammar. The students then move into the major part of the day's activities: writing articles. In a 1993 study of those who had attended NEWSCAMP during the past five years, editing emerged as one of the most important skills learned by the students. One respondent, a high school freshman, commented that:

> I learned how to edit sentences and sometimes I find myself doing that to sentences in books and newspapers. My writing is a lot more clear and prolific. I've learned to get right to the point and report the facts. I constantly revise all my stories, looking for what might describe something better or just making my writing sound better.

In concert with a colleague, Dr. Diana Peck, the author has instituted one-day

workshops entitled "Grammar for Business Writing" (Appendix B). The techniques used in the class are based on journalistic copy editing. Charts of standard copy-editing symbols are distributed to participants, who practice using them to correct grammatical errors in sentence exercises. Throughout the session, as they write varied business communiques, the attendees concentrate on changing errors to make their copy error-free. Feedback and evaluations indicate that the approach is well-received.

For group sessions at large firms, Drs. Peck and Lesher have instituted varied programs, including two-hour crash workshops on grammar and writing (Appendix B) A pre-analysis of the employees' writing usually shows that the work is plagued by grammar mistakes. Thus, in the group classes, the instructors introduce basic grammar through editing techniques. Those participants identified as having serious writing problems move into tutoring; in these sessions, the professors reinforce the need to identify problem areas through proper editing of written work. This instructional sequence has proved successful.

Reportorial techniques extend beyond the American newsroom. In the classroom or in corporate offices, "writers" must prepare memos, informal reports, proposals, and grant requests. These communiques could be strengthened by adherence to copy-editing principles which, in turn, could provide a study of grammar. The overall effect could prove important in the bid to strengthen writing and grammar.

References

Baskett, Floyd, Jack Sissors and Brian Brooks. *The Art of Editing*. New York: Macmillan, 1986.

Berner, Thomas. *The Process of Writing News*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1992.

Brooks, Brian and James Pinson. *Working With Words*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1993.

Fedler, Fred. *Reporting for the Print Media*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1993.

French, Christopher (ed.) *Associated Press Stylebook*. New York: Addison-Wesley Publishing, 1987.

Gilmore, Gene. *Modern Newspaper Editing*. Ames, Iowa: Iowa State University Press, 1990.

Harrigan, Jane. *The Editorial Eye*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1993.

Harriss, Julaind, Kelly Leiter and Stanley Johnson. *The Complete Reporter*. New York: Macmillan Publishers, 1985.

Lesher, Tina. "Coaching Field Is Wide Open." *Press Woman*. September 1986.

Lesher, Tina. "Teaching Reporting and Grammar." *Coaches' Corner*, December 1991.

Lesher, Tina. *The Writing Coach Movement: Teaching Composition in a New Context*. Unpublished dissertation, Rutgers University, 1988.

Mencher, Melvin. *News Reporting and Writing*. Dubuque, Iowa: William Brown Publishers, 1991.

Metz, William. *Newswriting From Lead to "30"*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1991.

Stein, M.L. "Readin' writin' and j-school," *Editor and Publisher*, August 22, 1992.

Appendix A
Tina Lesher

Reference Chart For Copy-Editing Symbols

1.	Abbreviate	She was born on August 4 in Urbana, Illinois.
2.	Boldface	This line should be set in boldface type.
3.	Capitalize	An american won the nobel prize.
4.	Center	Continued on Page 10
5.	Change letter	Their hoxe is expenrive.
6.	Change word	She received ~~three~~ four gifts.
7.	Close up space between words	Their car was ~~totally~~ destroyed.
8.	Close up space within a word	Their children r an outsi de.
9.	Continues on next page	More
10.	Delete letter	Theyreceiveed the mongey.
11.	Delete phrase	They did not use ~~any unneeded or~~ unnecessary words.
12.	Delete punctuation	They asked, if he was safe. OR: They asked if he was safe.
13.	End of story	### OR: -30- OR: -0-
14.	Flush left	The typesetter will begin this line at the left margin.
15.	Flush right	The typesetter will end this line at the right margin.
16.	Ignore correction (Correct as written)	Stet
17.	Insert apostrophe	It's good you're going home.
18.	Insert colon	He set three goals: success, health and wealth.

19.	Insert comma	The girl 7 lives with her grandmother.
20.	Insert dash	The score was 87 to 53 a disaster.
21.	Insert exclamation point	"What I don't believe it" she exclaimed.
22.	Insert hyphen	The 7 year old girl lives with her mother.
23.	Insert letter	Their car filed to sart.
24.	Insert period	John C Kefalis received the scholarship OR: John C Kefalis received the scholarship
25.	Insert quotation marks	This is easy, he said.
26.	Insert semicolon	Don't go he needs your help.
27.	Insert word	He writes often clever poetry.
28.	Italic	Some publications set words in italics for emphasis.
29.	Lowercase (Do not capitalize)	The Mayor failed To arrive.
30.	No new paragraph	To generate more publicity, the candidate announced that he would work at 100 different jobs. He spent the remainder of his campaign picking tomatoes, plucking chickens, hauling trash, digging ditches and driving trucks.
31.	Separate words	Journalists arecritical ofpolitical gimmickry.
32.	Spell out numbers or words	She said 8 people will go to Ala.
33.	Start new paragraph	Another man campaigned on roller skates. His wife explained: "We met at a roller skating rink, and we thought it would be a fun idea. He's going house to house, subdivision to subdivision on his skates, and people remember him."
34.	Transpose letters	Typists often transpose letters.
35.	Transpose words	Happily, he accepted the award.

Appendix B
Tina Lesher

Workshops

GRAMMAR FOR BUSINESS WRITING

Date: Friday, November 13, 1992
Location: Telemedia Center, Wayne Hall
Time: 9:00 a.m.–4:00 p.m. (There is a one-hour lunch break from noon to 1:00 p.m.)
Fee: $95 (includes lunch)
Course No.: CTED399-09 (noncredit; .6 CEUs)
Coordinators: Dr. Diana Peck, Associate Professor, Department of Communication, and Dr. Marina Cunningham, Assistant Director, Center for Continuing Education, WPC.

The workshop is designed to help enrollees improve their business writing skills. Emphasis is placed on the use of correct grammar in business communication. Anyone who writes memos, letters, reports or standard business communiques will benefit from learning writing skills through grammatical techniques. Participants can use this one-day session to improve clarity, precision and expressiveness in their writing.

Here are some quotes from participants in the spring 1991 workshop: *"I really got the rules of writing under my belt..." "The class helped us understand some grammar rules—some that I was violating..." "Today I have learned new techniques on better writing."*

Workshop leaders Diana Peck and Tina Lesher oversee a hands-on approach wherein participants write, edit and discuss their work throughout the day. Seminar topics include:

- Grammar Review
- Punctuation and Capitalization
- Sentence Structure
- Noun/Verb Agreement
- Dangling Modifiers
- Colons vs. Semicolons
- Editing/Proofreading
- The Written Product

The workshop is held in the Telemedia Center, a state-of-the art computer facility used by communication majors at William Paterson College. The room features computers, conference tables, audiovisual equipment and graphics/desktop publishing areas.

Who Should Take This Workshop? Secretaries, managers, executives, consultants, teachers—persons who want to improve their writing skills by learning grammar, the rules of language.

In the "real world," individuals deal regularly in "pragmatic communication" which demands use of well-structured, gramatically correct language. Business proposals, journalistic articles, technical pieces, speeches and even memos warrant proper grammar and word usage to convey their respective messages. However, a person never versed in the use of modifiers must struggle to determine what constitutes a "dangling participle." Noun/verb agreement continues to prove problematic to the "untrained" communicator.

—Diana Peck and Tina Lesher, "Case for Good Grammar Is Object or a Subject," *The Sunday Star-Ledger*, April 22, 1990.

WORKSHOP LEADERS:

Dr. Diana Peck, associate professor and former chairperson of the Department of Communication at William Paterson College, has served as director of the College's Center for Communication. She is author of *The Cable Television Franchising Primer* and numerous articles on new communication technologies. Dr. Peck, who teaches language as communication systems, holds a B.F.A. degree from Boston University and an M.A.T. from Trenton State College. She was awarded master's and doctoral degrees in communication from Teachers College, Columbia University.

Dr. Tina Lesher, assistant professor of print journalism at William Paterson College, is an award-winning journalist and accredited public relations counselor. She has taught business and technical writing and has served as a writing consultant for several New Jersey firms. Dr. Lesher received her B.A. degree in history from Wheeling Jesuit College and her M.A. from the University of Missouri School of Journalism. She holds a doctorate in language arts education from Rutgers University.

Drs. Peck and Lesher have coauthored articles on the need to strengthen grammar and writing skills.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Network for Effective Writing Skills

Dr. Tina Lesher & Dr. Diana Peck
583 Birch Avenue
Westfield, NJ 07090
Telephone & Fax (914) 478-2424

PROPOSAL

MINTZ ROSENFELD & COMPANY

CAN YOU READ ME? TWO WORKSHOPS FOR BETTER WRITING

WORKSHOP I: GRAMMAR CRASH COURSE

A two-hour refresher course covering editorial grammar:

* Punctuation
  Is it it's or its? Who is sure whether it's who's or whose? Where does that comma go, anyway? And why doesn't it belong here? What is the difference between a colon and semi-colon? You mean a semi-colon can only be used in two different situations and that's it?

* Agreement
  How can careful writers know the right verb form or the right pronoun to use in different situations?

* Sentence structure
  When is a sentence not a sentence?

* Modifiers
  What is a participle and when is it dangling?

* And other matters of pronouns, verbs, et al.

WORKSHOP II: WRITERS' FINISHING SCHOOL

A two-hour course in how to polish grammically correct writing, concentrating on:

* Clarity
  Writing so others know what you mean the first time through

* Economy
  Writing without excess -- saving the writer's and reader's time

* Tone
  Writing with the right subtext -- getting people to take your message seriously without offending them

* Style
  Making your writing your own -- developing your own recognizable style

Form-Function Parsing: Exploring the Structure of a Sentence Without Diagramming It

Wanda Van Goor and William Mullinix

Form-Function Parsing is a simple, fail-safe method for analyzing the structure of a sentence. We first show students transparencies of various diagramming systems applied to the same sentence: Reed-Kellog, Immediate Constituent, Systemic (Functional) Trees, and a Transformational/ Generative chart. By the time they have dealt with all of these, they welcome a system that does not require them to rewrite the sentence or draw complicated diagrams. That system has ten steps.

The first step is to label the word forms (parts of speech) above each word in the sentence. In addition to the usual codes for noun, pronoun, etc., we insist that verb forms be coded Vb, Vs, Ved, V, Ving, Ven, and toV. Thus "The teachers are requiring him to learn grammar" would be coded D, N, Vb, Ving, Pn, toV, N.

Having identified the helping and main verb forms above the line, we next bracket and label the predicate verb; doing so also enables us to label the verb forms as helping or main. The next three steps require the student to deal with all of the modifiers in the sentence, to "get rid of them" by brackets and arrows so that the basic structure of the sentence is clearly visible.

In the last four steps, the student asks a series of questions that reveal (1) whether the verb is intransitive, linking, transitive/passive, or transitive active and (2) the pattern of the sentence.

We have found that students do not automatically reject this system the way they tend to reject "diagramming." They soon discover also that if they can parse a sentence they have written, the sentence is usually clear—and that if they cannot, the sentence is probably flawed. One student dubbed the system "Bottom Line Diagramming" because a sentence is in trouble if the bottom line is not one of the standard English sentence patterns.

We highly recommend Form-Function Parsing. Here's how we tell students to do it.

When parsing a sentence ...

1. Above the sentence, label the forms.
2. Below the sentence, bracket and label the Predicate Verb (PV).
3. Go to the end of the sentence. Working backwards, bracket prepositional phrases. Arrow them to what they modify.
4. Go to the end of the sentence. Working backwards, bracket verbal phrases and subordinate clauses, leaving room to go inside the brackets. Arrow them appropriately.

Wanda Van Goor, professor of English at Prince George's Community College, has taught the college's grammar courses for fifteen years. She is author of *Grammar: A Good Beginning* and co-author with Diana Hacker of *Bedford Basics: A Workbook for Writers*.

William Mullinix is an assistant professor of English at Prince George's Community College. In addition to teaching composition to students whose first language is not English he has taught a grammar course each semester for about six years.

---

5. Draw arrows from any remaining modifiers to what they modify.
6. Find the simple subject (SS) and the subject (S). Bracket the S if it is not already bracketed. Label the S.
7. Do you have anything left? If not, the PV is either passive (p) or intransitive (i). Check:
   — If the helping verb (HVb) closest to the main verb (MV) is a "be" form and the MV is a Ven, the verb is passive and the pattern is S-PVp.
   — If not, the verb is intransitive and the pattern is S-PVi.
8. If you have one thing left and the PV is passive, the remainder is a retained object and the pattern is S-PVp-RO.
9. If you have one thing left and the PV is *not* passive, ask yourself "Does the remainder rename or describe the subject?"
   — If yes, the verb is linking and the pattern is S-PVl-SC.
   — If no, the verb is transitive and the pattern is S-PVt-DO.
10. If you have *two* things left, ask "Can I put 'to' or 'for' in front of the first thing?"
   — If yes, the pattern is S-PVt-IO-DO.
   — If no, ask "Can I put 'to be' between the two things?"
   If yes, the pattern is S-PVt-DO-OC.

Now go inside each dependent clause and do the same thing.

References

Hacker, Diana. *The Bedford Handbook for Writers*. Boston: Bedford Books of St. Martin's Press, 1991.

Van Goor, Wanda. *Grammar: A Good Beginning*. Largo, Md.: Prince George's Community College, 1993.

Appendix
Wanda Van Goor and William Mullinix

Sample Sentences For Parsing

(Most of these sentences are taken from Diana Hacker's work.)

PVi

1. An ass loaded with gold climbs to the top of the mountain.
2. A journey of a thousand miles must begin with a single step.

PVp

3. The pain of grief is usually softened by time.
4. What can't be cured must be endured.

PVpRO

5. A silent fool is often thought wise.

PVl

6. The handwriting on the wall may be a forgery.
7. Talent is what you possess; genius is what possesses you.

PVtDO

8. Kleptomaniacs can't help helping themselves.
9. When the well is dry, we suddenly know the worth of water.

PVtIODO

10. Never give a sucker an even break.
11. Fate gives us our relatives; we give ourselves our friends.

PVtDOOC

12. A prudent man does not make the goat his gardener.
13. Some folk want their luck buttered.

Interesting Sentences To Play With:

14. My favorite chore is milking the cow.
15. My favorite son is milking the cow.
16. Paul claimed that he wrote that speech that Marcus used in the forensics contest.
17. The time (that) I arrived is irrelevant.
18. Winston Churchill would not put up with pedantry.
19. The waiter served me my steak rare.

Empowering the Student with a Grammatical Vocabulary

Ellen Ronee Pollachek

In his opening chapter to *Lives On the Boundary: A Moving Account of the Struggles and Achievements of America's Educational Underclass* Mike Rose introduces the reader to Laura, a Mexican-American student who signed up for Rose's remedial English class a total of six times, dropped the class five of them and was now on her sixth try.

> 'I get in there,' she says 'and everything seems okay. But as soon as we start writing I freeze up. I'm a crummy writer, I know it. I know I'm gonna make lots of mistakes and look stupid. I panic. And I stop coming.'

Everyone can identify with Laura. We've all had the experience of replaying a sentence over and over in our brains wondering how it could have been phrased less clumsily. We've also read accounts of writers who were blocked for as little as a day, and as long as a decade. But what impressed me more than the commonality of Laura's dilemma, was how clearly she expressed herself. Not only did she know what she felt, she was able to connect her feeling to words.

In response to such an articulate student a teacher might suggest freewriting as a way to overcome self-consciousness. Drafting or clustering exercises are other alternative measures to help smoke out our internal judges who condemn us to impotency. writing a letter to an imaginary friend is another tool. Surprisingly, Rose suggests none of these. The problem, he concludes, is not one of being too self-conscious, the problem is "grammar."

> The Middle Ages envisioned the goddess of grammar, Grammatica, as an old woman. in one later incarnation, she is depicted as severe, with a scalpel and a large pair of pincers. Her right hand, which is by her side, grasps a bird by its neck, its mouth open as if in a gasp or a squawk. All this was emblematic, meant as a memory aid for the budding grammarian. But, Lord, how fitting the choices of emblem were -- the living thing being strangled, beak open but silent, muted by the goddess Grammatica. And the scalpel, the pincers, are reminders to the teacher to be vigilant for error, to cut it out.... (Rose 1-2)

If this paper were for another discipline, feminism perhaps, I might object to the gender of the figure depicted. But, at the moment, the gender of the gods is not nearly as relevant as the gender of the nouns and the tenses of verbs. In contrast to Grammatica, Rose gives us Dr. Gunner.

> She is encouraging her students to tell her what they already know about Greek culture. Someone mentions Aristotle; someone else says "Oedipus Rex....and the Oedipus complex." "Who wrote about the Oedipus complex?" asks Dr. Gunner. "Freud," offers a soft voice from the end of the table.... "Narcissus," says Dr. Gunner. "Narcissus. Who was Narcissus?" A guy who fell in love with himself," says the boy with his head in his arms.
>
> The hour goes on, the class warms up, students let down their defenses, discussion drifts back and forth along the time line. Someone asks about a book he read in high school called The Stranger. Another knows that renaissance "means rebirth in the French language." Socrates and Plato get mentioned, as do Mars and Apollo. Dr. Gunner's first name is Eugenia; she writes it on the board and asks the class what Greek word it looks like: "Gene," says the girl with the sharpener and stapler. A halting "genetics" comes from the wary girl. "Eugenia, eugen..." says the boy with the baseball cap, shifting in his chair. "Hey, that means something like race or good race." "Race control," says the boy with his head in his arms.
>
> These are the truly illiterate among us. (2-3)

Ellin Ronee Pollachek is on the faculty at CCNY.

I was introduced to Rose's work during my first semester of doctoral studies at NYU. I had received an M.A. in Theatrical Theory and Criticism thirteen years earlier and, having published two novels and numerous insignificant articles in the interim, I was again ready to engage my brain in the thinking process. My reasons for entering the Teaching and Learning department at NYU were fairly simple. I wanted to teach and the fact that I had a great rapport with John Mayher, Teaching and Learning head and author of Uncommon Sense didn't hurt any.

Lives On The Boundary, as were all the books introduced during my studies in the Teaching and Learning program, was particularly sympathetic to the underclass. Women had a special place in the hearts and minds of the program as well, but only if they had not internalized the "patriarchal" tongue. In theory, all of this read well. The world was in trouble. The old ways didn't work. The old ways, created by white men and patriarchal-tongued goddesses, were bent on structure, discipline, order and neatness. The new way said "let's let go of the old and bring in the new. Let's make learning an internal job". Since knowledge couldn't be imparted, students had to become their own teachers while teachers, at best, could facilitate.

These changes began "with the publication of books like Jonathan Kozol's Death at an Early Age (1967) Postman and Weingartner's Teaching as a Subversive Activity and in 1970 Charles Silberman's Crisis in The Classroom...[with] an emphasis on 'the child not the syllabus' and a conscious attempt to look at and value minority children and an attempt to stay in the moment rather than the past" (Britton et. al. 116-117). What hasn't been addressed is what happens when theory turns to practice and the students being taught don't have Mayher's, Friere's, Britton's or Nat Hentoff's background and/or motivation.

I've seen some of the results of this sort of laissez-faire teaching. Having had the opportunity to apply theory to practice by teaching in three of New York City's inner city colleges I return to Rose and object to his choice of the word "illiterate." Dr. Gunner's students weren't any more illiterate than I. Perhaps they were disenchanted or bored or impoverished but they were not illiterate. Rose, like many others with good intentions, has manipulated the reader's sympathies so that she side with one segment of the population at the expense of another. Many of my students, college freshmen and sophomores, were in fact illiterate and I don't use this term lightly. It wasn't because it took them an hour to warm-up and wasn't because they were slow to say "eugenics." "Illiterate" means they wrote essays in the following way.

> This photo reflect a little girl very happy because she is runing* on the country. But it is just a promotion because they want to impres* children and parents, theyfore* they present this photo.
>
> Behind this photograph you can found* out the truth of this "bady* copy" because it is not a paradise like they promote in this "bady* capy*." I said that because my friend Catty* sended her daugther* last summer in one of those trips and she tall" me that the children did thinks parents doesn't like it becuase* this trip was different relate with the trip that they promote....
>
> * The student's spelling.

This was in response to a final exam question in which I asked the students to explore the messages, images and dynamics in an ad sponsored by a well-known clothing store for the Fresh Air Fund. The student whose answer I've excerpted was not stupid. In fact she was smart enough to know just how bad her English was which is more than I can say for students with more advanced skills than hers. She put forth a maximum amount of effort, handed in every homework assignment and, despite her having a full time job, did not miss a single class. She was tormented by her inability to write English and I, by my inability to magically impart my knowledge to her. In large part the frustration we both felt was a result of her having no vocabulary with which to dialogue. She didn't even know what to ask for.

Dictionaries are an answer but only if the person using them has a clue as to how to spell the word she's after. In the passage cited above

how would the student know "tall" should be "told"? Assuming that she knew "tall" only referred to height, which she didn't, how would she know that "told" is the word for which she is looking when it is clear from her writing she has no sense of tenses. How could she know that "told" is the past tense of "tell?"

The problem would be difficult enough if the class were homogenous but it wasn't. It never is. How does one teach a student with practically no grammatical skills when sitting next to her is a student whose reply to the same question read:

> Barney's New York, a prestigious clothing store in Manhattan, recently published an advertisement called "Buy a Miracle" in support of the Fresh Air Fund. In this advertisement, we see a little black girl running barefoot through an area of grassland, which is suppose to simulate the country.
> .....

Where to begin? What do these two students have in common? How does a teacher engage both without losing one? One solution might be to ignore the first student and teach to the second. The opposite could also be argued but then you're assured of losing one and, if you make the wrong choice, you could lose both.

I found that by offering students a grammatical vocabulary they could at least articulate some of their frustrations. Vocabulary allows them to use the correct terminology when dialoguing with one another. I might begin by placing a sentence on the board and let the class figure out how to correct it. How do we know when to use "reflect" rather than "reflects?" Some students think it's a guessing game.

I generally begin by asking students to construct the verb "to go." Beginning with the pronoun "I" we go through the list.

I go
s/he goes
it goes
you go
we go
they go

Now the fun begins. Staying with the verb "to go" I throw out alternative nouns. For instance -- Sally *what*. Sally go is the answer I get nine times out of ten. O.K. Sally is what? Is Sally and "I" a "he" "she" "we"? Someone yells out that "Sally is a she." O.K. back to our list. Replace she with Sally and what do we have? *Sally* goes. Then I throw out "Sam", "book", "man," "John and me", "Richard and Alfonso", "the dog". This actually serves two purposes. It allows the students to think while they are constructing. What is the noun in relation to the pronoun/verb conjugation? A "book" is an "it." So the book takes the same form as the "it." After we go over this a few times I return to the verb that began the discussion: reflect. In the sentence "[t]his photo reflect" what is "this photo?" It is an "it". What does that mean? It means that if "it" takes the verb "goes" then in other regular verbs the "s" is also placed at the end of the word. It "reflects" is the correct conjugation and so "this photo reflects" is also correct.

Granted, this is a rather elaborate way of explaining something that those of us born to standard English speaking homes knew by the time we were five but today's student body is different than student bodies of 25 years ago. The object of teaching tenses, parts of speech or sentence construction is not to be redundant, that is, it is not to teach students what they already know but quite the opposite. It is to teach them what they don't know. We want to help them construct and communicate meaning. If the object is "meaning-making" (Mayher 4) and

> [n]othing in the uncommonsense position should be taken to mean that linguistic form doesn't count or isn't important. The debate is not between people who have high standards and care about form and those who are sloppy and unconcerned with linguistic property. The dispute is properly construed much more in terms of means than ends, particularly if those ends are viewed from a long-range perspective. The way we write and speak and spell and punctuate does count, but it is vitally important to remember that the most significant reason it counts is not a matter of linguistic etiquette or even appearing to be middle class, but of making it easier for readers to make meaning from our texts. (Mayher 34-35)

then why are we depriving the very students who

need our help the most of the ability to make meaning. Meaning-making is not a one-sided coin. Unfortunately language skills are not like a Chinese menu where one can choose one from column A and another from column B. What one can't comprehend, one generally dislikes and what one dislikes one doesn't do. If one doesn't do it then one can't develop a skill for it.

This became apparent to me this past semester. In my more advanced literature class I allowed my students to choose the play they wanted to read. They chose Othello because it was famous and because it was about a black man. What I had them do was read the play on their own before discussing it in class. Their responses were unanimous. That hated it.

I had anticipated that response. We all tend to hate what we don't understand. I saw it as my responsibility, as my job in fact, to enlighten them about the play. I didn't set out to have them like it, although I had hoped they would. In the end, even if they ended up hating Shakespeare I wanted them to do so intelligently. I wanted them to be able to express why they didn't like his work.

We read the play together as a class. We discussed vocabulary, setting, style as well as how the racial issues of the time were different from our own. Who was Othello? Was he your average black man? If not, what made it permissible for him to marry a white woman? Whose point-of-view is being projected? What codes are being used in order to paint the picture that's being painted? What makes Iago a villain? And of course what do the words mean? What is a black ram? A white ewe? Fair? Why crocodile tears?

What changed was not only the students' appreciation of the play but their opinion of themselves. They had begun to create a vocabulary which allowed them to ask their questions differently. They began to recognize code words, humor, tragedy. They began to feel powerful.

If one would not expect a student to read Shakespeare without some coaching why would we expect a student to read and write standard English without similar coaching? Is it because Elizabethan English is no longer spoken? Have those of us educated and teaching in ivory towers forgotten that standard English is just as foreign to some students as Elizabethan English is to the rest of us?

Learning to put a sentence together is important in its reciprocal affect. Writing a sentence generally indicates reading a sentence. Even if a student can't correct herself, as long as she can understand the criticism she's one step ahead of the game. Making-meaning comes from comprehensive thought. This became even more obvious when I received some of the papers in response to a final exam question I had given this same literature class. We had spent a third of the semester going over poetry. One of the questions on the final had to do with Dudley Randall's poem "Old Witherington." I've typed two of the poem's three stanzas below.

Old Witherington had drunk too much again.
The children changed their play and packed around him
To jeer his latest brawl. Their parents followed.

Prune-black, with bloodshot eyes and one white tooth,
He tottered in the night with legs spread wide
Waving a hatchet. "Come on, come on," he piped,
"And I'll baptize these bricks with bloody kindling.
I army be old and drunk, and not afraid
To die. I've died before. A million times
I've died and gone to hell. I live in hell.
If I die now I die, and put an end
To all this loneliness. Nobody cares
Enough to even fight me now, except
This crazy bastard here."

I asked the students to write about what was happening, who the other people in the poem were and what symbolism, imagery, dialogue and language within the poem supported their answers. Here is one response.

> In my opinion, I believe that what is happening in "Old Witherington" is that this old man had drunk too much and because of this everybody is making a fun of his fight noisily. His color is black and he is doing to tottered in the night. What happening here is that he was trying to baptize his bricks with bloody kindling, because he wanted to put an end to all of his loneliness.
>
> Loneliness that made him to not be afraid to die. Because he had died before.
>
> The other people who are in this

poem, are his neighbors because he does not them and even god.

After reading this response would anyone argue that this student was able to make meaning of the poem? Is it not clear from his response that not only could he not construct a standard sentence he was also unable to make sense of one. Is there any indication that the student understood what was meant by "baptiz[ing] these bricks with bloody kindling" or what was meant by Witherington dying many times before? It is doubtful that he knew what "tottered" meant. And I should mention that they were allowed to use a dictionary during the exam.

Somewhere along the line teaching has become confused with social work. Some educators feel the need to rectify public misgivings toward the underclass by attributing to them a romance that doesn't exist. There is nothing romantic or charming or powerful about an adult who can't fill out a job application or a third grader whose reading skills are superior to her parent's.

Educators who object to "a causative relationship between holding the line on error correction and [societal] problems" (Mayher 32) are quite right in doing so. Somehow the connection between "bad writing .....[as] a form of wrongdoing, related to other and more lurid ethical faults" (Lang II) must be broken. But that can't be done by reinforcing the status quo and thus guaranteeing a continuation of our alienated society.

My point is that by letting students in on the conventions of language we empower them so that they can transform themselves from "outside" to "insider." They may choose to use street jibe talk with their friends but in the world of money and power the first revelation of self is speech. Since we tend to write the way we speak, the inability to write "standard" English is a good indication that one can't speak it either. My attempt to teach writing by introducing grammar skills is an attempt to teach speaking as well as meaning-making.

There was a time when it seemed that those of us who spoke perfect English the moment we left the womb were destined for great things while everyone else had to be satisfied with less because they *were* less. But the complexion of America is changing and the current dictum which precludes grammar instruction from classes merely serves to reinforce an outdated stratification of labor, one in which verbal skills have taken over where biology left off. If biology is not longer destiny why should verbal skills constitute destiny? It seems that those in positions of power are guaranteeing that they maintain power by refusing to share the wealth of grammatical and communicative skills with those who need them the most.

I am suggesting a far more magnanimous and pragmatic approach to teaching and learning--one in which we teach people the basic skills they'll need to become who it is they really want to become. I see that as the ultimate power and the most powerful freedom of all.

References

Britton, Shafer, Watson. (eds.) (1990) *Teaching and Learning English Worldwide*. England: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Lang, Berel. (1991) *Writing and the Moral Self*. NY: Routledge.

Mayher, John S. (1990) *Uncommon Sense*. NH: Boynton/Cook.

Rose, Mike. (1989) *Lives On The Boundary*. NY: Penguin Books.

It's Elementary My Dear Students (*or is it?*) Selected Teachers' Perceptions on Grammar's Role in the Elementary School

Melissa Whiting

Grammar instruction has been a standard feature of academic schooling since the inception of the school itself. Advocated by educators as the principal form of English instruction in the schools and then subsequently condemned by this same group as destructive to the learning of English, grammar and the schools have tenuously danced cheek to cheek throughout the years. Although, grammar's dance card might not be as filled as it once was, grammar has yet to leave the dance floor of English instruction.

As a high school teacher, I found myself both mystified and frustrated by the grammar issue. Students would shuffle into my classroom, loudly complaining about how they hated English class with grammar being the central focus of what they hated most about English. This idea was not a recently formed one either; many students told me that they were sick to death of learning the same things over year after year, they hated the rules they were forced to learn and, thus, they hated English class. I asked them where did this distaste for English actually begin, and all agreed that it was in elementary school where the stagnancy took hold. I hadn't been back to elementary school in many, many years, but I decided it was time to return to the place where grammar study is introduced. So, led by a strengthening puzzlement, I checked out several elementary English textbooks and discovered that many of the complaints my students conveyed were justified. Met with rows and rows of "fill in the blanks" and myriads of rules with blank lines left for stale sentences, I felt an oddly familiar feeling of depression settling over me. I imagined eager eight year olds sitting expectantly in their assigned desks thirsting for stimulation and being presented with these boring lessons. I wondered how these elementary school teachers felt about the material over grammar which they presented every year to these schoolchildren. Did they too wonder why they did it?

Once I returned to the university world as a doctoral student, I was eager to begin research in this area. If grammar instruction has such harmful effects as many renowned researchers have attested (Braddock, Lloyd-Jones, and Schoer, 1963; Postman and Weingartner, 1966; Elley, Batham and Wylie, 1976; Hillocks, 1986), why are teachers still unable to abandon their reliance on traditional grammar as an essential part of their language arts instruction? As a teacher of eleventh grade English as well as an AP Language and Composiiton class, I had not had any formal contact with the grammar books for years. My classes concentrated on British Literature and essay writing with a "description" rather than "prescription" type attitude. Yet, in the forty different elementary schools of the teachers I later polled, this didn't seem to be the case.

I initially polled approximately 100 elementary school teachers and found that all

Melissa Whiting is completing her doctoral studies at the University of Oklahoma, Norman, Okla., where she is a university supervisor for student teachers in English Education. She also is a writing specialist in the Athletic Student Life Office as well as being an item writer for GED.

of these third through fifth grade teachers taught what they considered to be some type of "formal" traditional grammar. Amazed, I felt something seemed amiss. I wondered, what were the factors involved which lead teachers to continue emphasizing grammar in the language arts class when research had shown it to be nonbeneficial and even detrimental to a child's growth in reading and writing when taught in the traditional way? How did teachers reasonably define grammar and its value and utility in the school curriculum? What forces influenced the continued reliance on the traditional study of grammar as an instructional method?

My pilot study had a perspective seeking base. I located five teachers from both rural and urban school systems in Oklahoma who taught either fourth or fifth grade. Their career levels were beginning year, five years, twelve years, seventeen years and twenty-two years. Three of the teachers had Master's degrees and one of the teachers was male. I set up a series of three one hour interviews with each teacher. My initial interview with each teacher focused on the early (prior to college) influences and forces within the teacher's own culture including school culture to try to make some connections with early recollections of grammar and the reasons why it's still being taught. In the second set of interviews, teachers talked about their teacher training and own classroom methods connected to grammar study including further professional developments in their field which might explain why grammar remained a stronghold in their classroom. The third set was more of a "tying it all together, if possible" type of interview where each discussed what influences keeps the formal study of grammar in their class. I considered the teachers' views on grammar study an essential part of the whole issue. As Anderson, Armbruster and Roe (1991) state:

> There is no doubting the influence of teacher's prior personal experience as students. According to Lortie (1975), "Teachers start in their professional preparation early in life; their entire school experience contributes to their work socialization." Notice that the amount of prior experience prospective teachers have with teachers and teaching is a couple of orders of magnitude greater than the amount that, say prospective doctors have with doctors and doctoring ... Inevitably this experience makes a deep impression. (p.191).

In a January, 1986 article in the *English Journal*, Sharon Taylor, a classroom teacher, suggests that teachers feel frustrated because researchers assume that

> ... teachers have access to a variety of methodologies and have the strategies and materials to employ them ... teachers reported that they had never been educated in any techniques for teaching grammar nor provided with any materials for teaching it while being trained as teachers.

Taylor goes on to call for research where teachers can be interviewed, and thus, by reflection on important issues, discover what personal and professional framework influences the way they teach.

In a 1939 article in *Elementary Education Review*, James Evans asks that researchers become more concerned

> ... with describing in detail what happens to pupils of each particular ability ... research workers in English can perform meritorious service by producing complete and detailed descriptions of how good teachers and school systems succeed in

> correlating and integrating language in the curriculum (and that) primary grades represent a wide-open field for language research.

By considering the content, methods, and materials in their own grammar curriculum as well as their own preparation based on ideology or outside factors connected with grammar study, interviewing selected elementary school teachers by recording their reflections of the process itself could better clarify the gap between existing research on grammar and its contradictory stronghold in the current English curriculum.

The whole data gathering process was utterly fascinating. I tape recorded all the interviews and then transcribed them in order to capture the complete essence of the interviews. The transcription process was exhaustive, but worthwhile. I found "themes" developing with each stage of the interviews. Fueled by the fact that I could find no similar research to the study I was conducting, I felt I was basically walking into some open territory.

I interviewed the teachers in their own classrooms usually after school or during their planning periods. Each of the five teachers appeared eager to talk to me and seemed happy to be able to voice their views.

So, what happened? No, after these interviews the Earth hasn't moved, grammar is still in the schools and more research is needed. What I did discover were the beginning of some themes emerging from the interviews. I imagine them as layers being unpeeled in an inverted triangle form with each layer leading into the next.

My first theme was ADMINISTRATIVE CONTROL. Most of these teachers discussed the fact that they continued to teach grammar because the "principal requires at least two grades handed into him a week, and grammar sheets are an easy way to get those grades." All of the teachers discussed the drudgery of the textbooks, but added that it was a good way to have structure and "get the grades out." Making the principal happy seemed to be an understandable goal of each teacher. Many said that when they had to be observed in a language arts class by the principal, teaching a grammar class was the "easiest" class to teach.

The next theme emerged as PARENTS. Parental expectations played a big role in why the teachers taught traditional grammar and why administrators expected them to teach grammar. Some gave the "if it was good enough for me, then it's good enough for my kid" adage as a reason why parents want to see grammar instruction in the classroom. Also, they reasoned that if grammar lessons could be taken home and armed with "that one right answer" parents could help their children with their work. Parents could remember grammar study (although probably not too fondly!) and could relate to the struggles and triumphs of their children when they had grammar homework to complete. One teacher mentioned that "it's easier for them to help them with their grammar since writing assignments don't have simple answers. Grammar provides answers if nothing else."

This theme led into the third theme of STANDARDIZED TEST SCORES. Testing on language arts by testing writing or giving a speech cannot be easily accomplished because viably correct answers won't instantly appear. Creating a test becomes infinitely easier when the answers are as solid as cement. But, like cement, these answers can also be considered as burdensome as one teacher noted, "Yeah, those tests. They say to not teach to the test, but you do it anyway because you just have to. I'd rather work on writing, but those tests don't work well with writing." If the tests have such a controlling influence on classroom activity, one would imagine that these teachers would have had special training in college to prepare them better to teach

grammar. Yet, with these teachers, this was not the case — none of them could remember having a class that just dealt with grammar or how to teach grammar. Since these teachers were all elementary school majors in college, these statements were truly not so surprising.

The next theme culminated into PROFESSIONAL COMPLACENCY. Three teachers argued that grammar had "always been there," it was something that everybody "had to teach." No one felt comfortable with trying to change the traditional method of teaching grammar because they didn't want to be labeled as an agitator and also, no one seemed willing to come in and show them a different way to teach this subject. An elementary teacher's day is rife with activity. Many subjects must be taught besides pulling several duties such as lunchroom and playground. I had the impression that many of these teachers would like a change, if only someone would come in and lead them by the hand in a new method while simultaneously fending off those who would oppose the change. I found myself sympathizing with their plight.

The last theme, GENERAL CONFUSION, appeared to be the base of the whole mess! None of the teachers interviewed seemed completely "settled" with the whole grammar issue. Contradictory statements dominated the interviews. When questioned over what they viewed as a "successful year" of language arts study, all agreed that improving writing and reading skills was at the top of their individual lists; however, all agreed that they did not have enough time to work on these skills because each had to devote at least 30 - 40 minutes a day to grammar study! Every teacher's school year began with at least a month of review on the previous year's grammar instruction and none felt comfortable at the end of the year that any of the rules they had taught had truly sunk in with their classes. All talked about "creative" activities such as journal writing and creative stories, but all expressed a reluctance to use them as valid grades for language arts. These teachers seemed perplexed over how to reconcile the differences between traditional methods and the reality within their own classrooms. Like one teacher assessed, "grammar study is good, but creative writing is the most fun. I wish we could do more of it, but there is so much to cover. I wish there was more time in the day to devote to just writing."

Given the time constraints, this pilot study does not boast that any "problem" has been solved, or for that matter even revealed. Nonetheless, I felt the insights offered by these teachers have given me different avenues of approach concerning the perplexing problem that the teaching of traditional grammar creates. Many layers are left to be unraveled contextually within grammar study. Further analysis should open up different concepts and developing theories. If the teachers who introduce grammar study to our school children have no clear way of defending why it continues to be studied, I only wonder why traditional grammar practice, as it still remains, continues. My approach being a naturalistic inquiry guided by phenomenological underpinnings might be expanded upon to include a micro-ethnographic study when I continue researching this subject. I would like to feel I can generate insights into how teachers interpret how and why they do what they do when teaching grammar, but obviously my pilot study is sitting on the proverbial "tip of the iceberg." I, as well as most educators, want to see all students at every level entering the classroom eager to learn, uninhibited by the fear of grammar study. Only further research can possibly yield answers.

References

Anderson, R.C., Armbuster, B.B., and Roe, M. (1991). Improving the education of reading teachers. In S.R. Graubard (ed.) *Literacy: An overview by 14 experts.* New York: The Noonday Press.

Braddock, R., Lloyd-Jones, R. and Schoer, L. (1963). *Research in written composition.* Champaign, IL: NCTE.

Elley, W.B., Barham, I.H., and Wylie, M. (1976). The role of grammar in a secondary school English curriculum. *Research in the teaching of English.*

Evans, J. (Nov. 1939). Needed research in language composition and grammar. *Elementary Education Review, Vol XXI.*

Hillocks, G. (1986). *Research on written composition: New directions for teaching.* Urbana, IL: NCTE.

Lortie, D.C. (1975). *Schoolteacher.* Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Postman, N. and Weingartner, C. (1966). *Linguistics: A revolution in teaching.* Dell Publishing Co. Inc.

Taylor, S. (Jan. 1986). Grammar curriculum: Back to square one. *English Journal, 75.* Urbana, IL: NCTE.

The Realities of Seventh and Eighth Grade Grammar Instruction

Mary Beth Voda

I'm glad I'm not twenty or thirty years old. If I were I wouldn't have the courage to be standing here today. Two years ago I attended my first conference of the Association of Teachers of English Grammar and came away with three major impressions. The first was that there were three "camps," represented: the prescriptive, descriptive and applied, and the allegiances to each were quite strong. Presenters held firm beliefs that the state of the English language today is variously deplorable and not what it used to be; lively and alive, flexible. A second impression was that the level of expertise at the conference was considerable. Participants combined strength of opinion about the status/teaching of English grammar with impressive credentials and knowledge. And, lastly, I came away feeling quite humbled in the presence of these educators, since the extent of my post high school grammar instruction is limited to one post graduate course. There was, clearly, a lot to learn, and my grammar education got a tremendous boost at the first conference.

These three impressions should have been enough to prevent me from ever considering a personal presentation and probably would have had I been twenty or thirty years old. But maturity emboldens us and supported my plan to speak to you about a fourth impression that I developed. As I listened to one speaker after another and read their biographies, I noticed that only one was not associated with post secondary education. Since I was then and am presently involved with junior high school students, I kept wondering why we weren't hearing from that sector of education. I determined to tell my story if and when the opportunity presented itself. Well, it didn't last year because conflicts made it impossible for me to attend the conference, but when the proposal request appeared in *Syntax in the Schools* this year I decided to let you all know what I see every day in the Wyalusing Area Junior/Senior High School, hence the title of this paper, "The Realities of Seventh and Eighth Grade Grammar Instruction."

How "scholarly" in the strictest academic sense it is is questionable, and I apologize to those of you who came to this conference expecting classic symposium presentations. This is, more accurately, a dialogue, the musings, mullings and questionings of a typical junior high school teacher as she struggles with the ever-changing responsibilities and duties facing her and her colleagues in trying to provide the best language arts education to their students. My present position is that of a Chapter One learning support teacher assigned to grades seven and eight in the Wyalusing Area School District. This past school year my assignment was to work with one seventh grade Language Arts Teacher and one from eighth grade as part of a three-person team. We shared planning and teaching responsibilities. I am not an expert in the field of grammar, or any other, nor am I a formal researcher. What I am is a lover of language who feels strongly that students need an understanding of their mother tongue in order to be global citizens of the twenty-first century. I also believe that knowledge of grammar is a definite part of such understanding and needs to be taught. I

Mary Beth Voda teaches junior high students in the Wyalusing Area Junior/Senior High School in Wyalusing, PA.

---

have no particular allegiance to any one approach and have, over some years, tried many in an effort to discover an effective, efficient method of teaching grammar fundamentals to our students. I, and my colleagues, are constantly searching for a consensus of what, when and how we should teach grammar. What I propose to do is tell you who our students are, what their language needs, abilities and experiences are and what my experiences, responsibilities and duties are. Once you have this "sketch," it is my hope that your expertise will be able to fill in the blanks and fill in the picture.

Having stated my intentions, I beg your indulgence for a moment in listening to two stories that, I hope, will offer some insight into a language lover's experience. The first has to do with a completely new opportunity for me, a teacher for twenty-five years, tutoring a student who speaks English as a second language. At the beginning of the 1992 school year a Hungarian family moved into Wyalusing, and their oldest son was placed in the eighth grade Language Arts class I co-taught. Somewhere I read that to teach is to learn twice, and this was a wonderful opportunity to experience language instruction through different eyes. Tamas was bright, motivated and eager to be accepted by his peers, so his grasp of English was swift. By Christmas he was able to converse fluently and no longer needed my help in reading and interpreting tests and assignments. He was, by the way, taking a typical eighth grade course of study. Obviously, the language immersion system worked well for this fourteen year old, and I noted how important two factors are in mastering subject matter: motivation was intense, and that most critical characteristic of adolescents, acceptance by one's peers, was equally important to him. I also observed something I had heretofore only read about; once someone has become fluent in his native language, mastery of another can be easily accomplished. Of course they tell us that it is critical for pronunciation clarity that the second language be learned before the age of eleven or twelve. Tamas' fluency is excellent; his speech, however, is heavily accented. Regarding his grasp of English grammar, he has a good memory and obviously is skilled in language acquisition. He does well, therefore, in sentence structure, grammar and mechanics. Occasionally, he will mistake verb tense. For example, he might say, "I didn't told him to do it"; however, these errors are easily corrected and usually not repeated.

A second language experience occurred just last week when I was visiting Tamas' family in Hungary. It was my wonderfully good fortune to be able to attend a performance of Wagner's Tannhauser at the Budapest Opera. In this magnificently glittering setting I heard a variety of languages being spoken and enjoyed a conversation with a delightful Japanese couple who shared a box with me. As the second act began I was suddenly aware of a most unique feeling — here I was speaking English to two Japanese people (one of them was also fluent in Hungarian), listening to an opera being sung in German while watching Hungarian super-titles flashed above the stage — imagine! I was now, more than ever, convinced that I had a responsibility to my students to provide them with an enriching language experience that would contribute to their becoming global citizens.

Now to these students. Who are they? Where do they live? What are they taught? The typical thirteen year old student I see lives in a rural school district in northeastern Pennsylvania which covers nearly three hundred square miles. She might live in one of four small communities surrounded by farms and woodlands. The area is sparsely populated with fewer than seven thousand inhabitants, a high percentage of whom are retired. A large meat packing company employs many low-skilled workers. In

addition, four large corporations — Proctor and Gamble, DuPont, Masonite and GTE — provide employment for many of the area's workers. Farming accounts for the second largest category of employment. This typical thirteen year old goes to the Wyalusing Area Junior/Senior High School with about nine hundred other seventh through twelfth grade students. She may travel as long as one and one-half hours one way to school. According to sources from social service agencies, she and up to half of her classmates may live in what is termed "non-traditional" family settings. The adults in charge of her care may be a natural parent, a natural parent and step-parent, grandparents, other relatives, etc. Her chances of being affected by alcoholism, abuse, neglect or teen pregnancy are higher than the state average. The isolation of rural life, according to these social agency sources, contributes to a higher incidence of these realities of many children's lives. This isolation also is a factor in the availability of culturally enriching experiences. Many of these students will not travel outside Pennsylvania; a significant number of them will not leave Bradford County.

What is this typical thirteen year old student taught about her language in seventh and eighth grade? She has one, forty-five minute class in Language Arts per day, five days each week. Reading, Writing, Speaking and Listening skills are taught in this class. The major teaching and practice in the language skills occurs in this class. There is some reading for information in History class, but no reading instruction and little reading practice in the content areas. This student will likely be in a class of thirty students, and her Language Arts teacher will have five such classes for a total of, on average, one hundred fifty students each day. Until the beginning of the 1992-93 school year there was no further support for these teachers. Chapter One services were available for seventh and eight grade students, but the delivery of these services was in a so-called "pull out" program. Students identified as needing support were taken out of study halls for remediation or were completely separated from the rest of the students in a developmental program. The Chapter One support teacher served as these students' Language Arts teacher. The curriculum was the same as all seventh and eighth grade students were taught, but the delivery of instruction was an individualized one. Class sizes were, on average, six students. For the recently-completed school year the administration determined that students would be served in an "in-class" model of support. That meant that they would not be pulled out of study hall for remediation or separate developmental Language Arts class. They were to be taught in a heterogeneous class setting, and the Chapter One support teacher would work with them in that setting. This might take the form of shared teaching, heterogeneous small grouping of students (each teacher works with a few small groups at one time) or activity period reteaching/reinforcement.

When we three junior high Language Arts teachers approached our duties at the beginning of the past school year we were faced with the above directive regarding the "how" of instruction. We already knew the "who" we were going to be teaching. A further directive to use an integrated Language Arts approach was issued and school began. Now we needed to determine the "what" in the now out-dated curriculum that we would be teaching. Since the only reading instruction students receive is in Language Arts class, and since our surveys indicate less than five percent of the students read for pleasure or read anything outside of school, we knew reading in class had to occupy a large part of class time. The same was true for writing; it's not taught or required in any other content area class. Writing had to have a large share of class time. Vocabulary instruction and use was

another area the teachers felt strongly about, and grammar was not going to be left out. Obviously much integration needed to occur for two reasons: it makes sense because it's real language experience, and there isn't much time available.

Until the beginning of the 1992 school year grammar had been taught as a separate unit. Some teachers didn't have students read any literature until nearly the end of the first semester. Others did not spend so long a time on grammar lessons, but the usual style of instructing took the form of skill/drill work-sheets and Warriner's exercises for as long as two weeks on one item — appositives, for example. Periodic quizzes and tests like the work-sheets were given, and during these times the faculty lunch table would be the sounding board for the Language Arts teachers' expressions of distress, frustration and annoyance over the students' performance.

At the beginning of the 1992 school year the new directives required different approaches, and the presence of the Chapter One Reading Specialist in the planning room and the classroom brought some new approaches to the delivery of the Language Arts instruction. As with the group assembled here, there were definite opinions on the "whats," "whys" and "hows" of grammar instruction, and for the team to work effectively all viewpoints needed to be considered. It was decided to integrate grammar into the reading and writing experience by identifying common, consistent writing errors and using them as a starting point for lessons in grammar. It was also decided to reinforce these lessons lifted from student writing with some work-sheets (usually assigned for homework after the lesson was taught). The vocabulary of grammar was also determined to be a necessary component of student knowledge, and concepts such as noun, verb, adjective, adverb, preposition, subject, predicate were included. Instead of spending an entire forty-five minute class period on grammar instruction, it was decided that it would be offered in ten minute segments at the beginning of the period; brief, directed instruction was followed by some practice which was followed by a homework assignment. The process writing approach was used and grading was done on a limited skill-focus basis. For example, adolescent writers often make subject-verb agreement errors. After prewriting, teachers identified a sampling of typical errors, demonstrated methods of correcting the errors, encouraged student participation in identifying the function of various words in the larger context of the piece and directed revising/rewriting activities to correct the errors. Often a work-sheet with student-generated mistakes was given as a homework assignment to be reviewed the next day. The final effort in the writing process was graded on a limited-focus basis; that is, subject-verb agreement might be the only area of the writing that received a grade.

As the teachers evaluated and assessed student progress, quiz and test grades indicated most students appeared to be mastering the grammar concepts throughout the year. Also, definite improvement was apparent in their writing with fewer errors in subject-verb agreement; more varied use of vocabulary, including descriptive adjectives; more sentence variety, including subordinate clauses; and improved mechanics, including fewer run-ons and fragments. In an end of the year grammar review test, however, only 66% of the students demonstrated mastery (80% or better) of the concepts that had been taught during the year. Scores from the standardized California Test of Basic Skills were not available at the time of the writing, but they will be used to assess last year's program and when the new curriculum is written this summer.

My colleagues and I continue to experience frustration when we see how little time is allotted to language instruction, the varied experiences, needs and skills of our students and the definite need for reading and writing across the curriculum. I come to you today to offer this sketch of what is happening in a typical, rural school and ask your help in clarifying the place grammar should occupy in its classrooms. Thank you.

Students' Rights to Their Own Language Revisited: An Attitude Survey

Terry Lynn Irons

The question of prescribing a Standard English in the educational setting is hardly new. But in the context of recent political demands for multicultural accommodation and various reactionary responses in the face of social and economic change, the question becomes increasingly problematic. Indeed, as Judith Rodby suggests, English has "become an ideological problem in the United States" (1992: 198).

Traditionally, the attitude in American schools has been one that favors teaching a prescriptive standard variety of English, with a presumptive goal of wiping out non-standard varieties or dialects. This approach to teaching English essentially reflects the melting pot idea of cultural homogeneity. It is a view of assimilation. A direct challenge to this view was presented by the membership of the Conference on College Composition and Communication nearly twenty years ago when the organization adopted the resolution that:

> We affirm the students' right to their own patterns and varieties of language — the dialects of their nurture or whatever dialects in which they find their own identity and style. Language scholars long ago denied that the myth of a standard American dialect has any validity. The claim that any one dialect is unacceptable amounts to an attempt of one social group to exert its dominance over another. Such a claim leads to false advice for speakers and writers, and immoral advice for humans. A nation proud of its diverse heritage and its cultural and racial variety will preserve its heritage of dialects. We affirm strongly that teachers must have the experiences and training that will enable them to respect diversity and uphold the right of students to their own language. (1974: 3)

It would be wrong to say that all teachers of English have embraced the ideas expressed in this resolution. On the other hand, the change in approach advocated here has had a profound effect on teaching methods, materials, and attitudes. It is these attitudes with which the present paper concerns itself. What do people today, particularly students, think about the ideas expressed in the CCCC resolution? It is this question that the study reported on here attempts to answer.

Method

The basis for the study is a survey instrument based on the CCCC resolution, Students' Rights to Their Own Language. The survey consists of eighteen statements about which the informant is asked to indicate agreement or disagreement. Five other items ask for biographical information about the informant. A sample is to be found in Appendix A.

Terry Lynn Irons is an Assistant Professor of English at Morehead State University, Morehead, Kentucky, where he teaches courses in linguistics, technical composition, and literature. His research interests are in the area of sociolinguistics and dialectology.

The statements on the survey may be divided into three general groups. Several items are basically verbatim statements from the CCCC resolution (8, 9, 11, 13, 15, 19, 22). Another group of items are direct implications of the resolution (6, 12, 14). Finally, several items deal with issues concerning Standard English and pedagogy (7, 10, 16, 17, 18, 20, 23).

To date, the survey has been administered to 423 subjects at three institutions of higher learning. Of these, 167 subjects (39.4%) are male; 256 subjects (60.6%) are female. A total of 389 subjects, or 91.9%, are enrolled as students; 34 subjects, or 9.1%, are instructors. The number of minority informants is too small to allow for any observations with respect to this variable, with any statistical validity. Basically, the informants are white — middle to upper middle class whites, at that. Thus the survey reflects essentially white attitudes.

Results and Discussion

The general results for each item in the survey are contained in Appendix B. At first glance, the results seem to be contradictory and full of inconsistencies. For example, in response to item 19, informants feel that students should be able to use a variety of language in which they use their own identity and style (70-30), but in response to item 20, informants agree with the statement that students should always be required to follow guidelines of Standard English in writing (62-38). One might surmise that a student should be able to use a variety of English in which he finds his own identity as long as that variety is consistent with the guidelines of Standard English! But should writing that is Standard English be evaluated higher than writing done in other varieties? See item 10 — perhaps not. Possible ways of accounting for this seeming contradiction will be considered below, but first specific remarks about each of the survey item clusters are in order.

Items from the Resolution

In general, the respondents are sympathetic with the spirit of the CCCC resolution (See Appendix B, Part I). It is worth noting, however, that the majority in favor of the resolution is not overwhelming. A somewhat unexpected curiosity is that students agree with the resolution in greater percentages than do instructors.

For example, in response to item 9, teachers must have the experience and training that will enable them to respect linguistic diversity..., three out of four students agree, while only three in five of the instructors agree. In another case, item 15, the claim that one variety is unacceptable leads to false advice for speakers and writers, approximately 64% of the students agree with the statement, but a majority of instructors, 59%, disagree with the claim. In fact, as can be seen in their response to item 10, instructors really believe that writing that is Standard English should be evaluated higher (in contrast with the general results on this item).

The one item from the resolution for which there is overwhelming disagreement is item 13, the idea that a standard variety of American English exists has no validity. Only 27% respondents agree with this statement with 73% not agreeing at all. In some ways, this finding counters all of the sympathy for the resolution, for the view that there is really no such thing as Standard English is the assumption from which the rest of the ideas in the resolution proceed. The subjects participating in this study believe that there is such a thing as Standard English (even though they may disagree over what it is), and this belief sets the stage for many of the responses in the rest of the survey.

Items Implicit in the Resolution

Three items are implied by the overall tone and purpose of the resolution. That is, if the resolution is really adopted, these ideas follow. The first is item 6, students should be able to use in school the variety of language they grow up speaking at home. Items 12 and 14 develop item 6, specifying the manner of use as first, speaking, and second, writing.

The responses are, to put it bluntly, contradictory. Overall, the subjects are split, 50-50, on using home language in the classroom. But when it comes to specifying manner of use, the numbers go down. Only 45% favor speaking the home language in the classroom. Even fewer, only 27%, feel it is permissible to write the home language in the classroom. It seems that it is okay to use the home language in the classroom as long as the student does not speak or write it. Do these subjects know of some other way to use language? If so, what is it?

Things look even more skewed when one considers responses to items 17 and 21. A majority of subjects, 63%, agree that their children would be best served by using both Standard English and their home language in the classroom, while only a minority, 47%, believe that their children would best be served by using only Standard English in the classroom. These responses clearly oppose the responses to items 12 and 14 discussed above.

Factoring out various responses by social variable helps clear things up somewhat. For example, in response to item 6, instructors disagree with the statement that home language should be used in the classroom, in a ratio of 6-4. Their responses to items 12 and 14 are also a fairly consistent disagreement. But the responses of the undergraduates, when factored out by year in school, show a curious pattern, one that may be interpreted as a kline of socialization. That is to say, freshpeople responses are fairly consistent across all three items, at about 50-50. But agreement consistently declines as length of time in school increases, particularly in response to item 14 about writing. This pattern suggests that students are fairly open-minded when they enter school, but they are socialized into, or learn, a less open-minded attitude about writing as they progress in their academic career. A similar pattern of socialization can be seen elsewhere in the data.

Items Concerning Standard English and Pedagogy

Several of the items on the survey are designed to elicit attitudes about Standard English, especially in relation to issues of teaching and pedagogy. (Of course, in a very real sense, the entire resolution is about Standard English and pedagogy; these additional items merely develop specific areas.) Some of these items have been touched on above. The rest are considered below.

The greatest level of agreement on any item in the survey is seen in the responses to item 7, one function of the schools is to teach Standard English. Only 16 people disagreed with this statement. Over 96% of the total, or 405 subjects, believe that, indeed, it is the function of schools to teach Standard English. What does this finding say about embracing or being sensitive to language diversity? Not much. For it is possible that some subjects see this as the function of schools as schools operate today, but they may not feel that this *should* be the function of schools. The "is" of the statement has an essential ambiguity to it, making the finding difficult to interpret properly.

As mentioned above, the results on items 10 and 20 suggest another possible contradiction. About 62% of the subjects feel that students should always follow guidelines of Standard English in writing, but only 43%

agree that writing that is Standard English should be evaluated higher than writing done in other varieties. The exception here is, of course, instructors, of whom seven in ten believe that writing that is Standard English should be evaluated higher. Factoring this group out makes the results look even more contradictory.

Last, but certainly not least, are two items concerning formal grammar instruction. In response to item 18, almost 70% agree that instruction in formal grammar is the best way for students to learn Standard English. Of course, the teachers know better, having been brainwashed by the ill-conceived studies supported by the nefarious NCTE: only three in ten agree, or, in other words, 70% disagree. But everyone comes to their (sic) senses when it comes to the final item 23, formal grammar should be taught at all grade levels. A little over four out of five, or 80%, support this proposition; even two out of three teachers agree that formal grammar should be taught. The question remains, however, what do we mean by formal grammar.

Conclusion

We might conclude, then, that this survey concludes nothing but is a maze of inconsistencies and contradictions. This may not prove to be the case, though, after the data are subjected to factor analysis, taking into account the various social and demographic variables. That analysis has not been completed at this time.

A second cause for the seemingly contradictory results has been hinted at in places above. That is, the statements themselves are expressed in categorical terms and hence are somewhat ambiguous. A follow up to this survey may soften or clarify terms of the statements and allow for a "depends" or a "sometimes" category of response.

When I first embarked upon this project, a colleague of mine remarked that she thought this issue was settled long ago, perhaps thinking of the Ann Arbor decision regarding black English. If nothing else, the results of the study demonstrate that this is far from the case. Attitudes are never settled; successive generations struggle anew, and the wheel turns.

N.B.: Reference to item numbers in the article is based on original survey numbers in Appendix A. These item numbers are noted in Appendix B in parentheses after each item.

References

Committee of CCCC Language Statement. 1974. "Students' Rights to Their Own Language," *College Composition and Communication* 25. Champaign-Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Rodby, Judith. 1992. "A Polyphony of Voices: the Dialectics of Linguistic Diversity and Unity in the Twentieth-century United States." In Tim Machan and Charles Scott, eds., *English in its Social Contexts*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 178-203.

Appendix A
Terry Lynn Irons

Survey

1. The name of your school is _____.

2. How are you classified? (circle one)
   freshman sophomore junior senior graduate faculty

3. What is your age?_____

4. What is your sex? (circle one) male female

5. What is your race? (circle one)
   Black Hispanic Caucasian American Indian Asian
   Other (please specify)_____

Please circle the response that best represents your beliefs for the following statements.

6. Students should be able to use in school the variety of language they grow up speaking at home.
   strongly agree agree disagree strongly disagree

7. One function of the schools is to teach Standard English.
   strongly agree agree disagree strongly disagree

8. The claim that any one dialect is unacceptable amounts to an attempt of one social group to exert its dominance over another.
   strongly agree agree disagree strongly disagree

9. Teachers must have the experiences and training that will enable them to respect linguistic (language) diversity and uphold the rights of students to their own language.
   strongly agree agree disagree strongly disagree

10. Writing that is Standard English should be evaluated higher than writing done in other varieties.
    strongly agree agree disagree strongly disagree

11. A nation proud of its heritage and its cultural and racial variety will preserve its heritage of dialects.
    strongly agree agree disagree strongly disagree

12. Students should be able to speak their home language in the classroom.
    strongly agree agree disagree strongly disagree

13. The idea that a standard variety of American English exists has no validity.
    strongly agree agree disagree strongly disagree

14. Students should be able to write in their home language in the classroom.
strongly agree agree disagree strongly disagree

15. The claim that one variety of language is unacceptable leads to false advice for speakers and writers.
strongly agree agree disagree strongly disagree

16. Standard English is the best variety of English for use in the classroom.
strongly agree agree disagree strongly disagree

17. My children would be best served by using both Standard English and their home language in the classroom.
strongly agree agree disagree strongly disagree

18. Instruction in formal grammar is the best way for students to learn Standard English.
strongly agree agree disagree strongly disagree

19. Students should be able to use a variety of language in which they use their own identity and style.
strongly agree agree disagree strongly disagree

20. Students should always be required to follow guidelines of Standard English in writing.
strongly agree agree disagree strongly disagree

21. My children would best be served by using only Standard English in the classroom.
strongly agree agree disagree strongly disagree

22. Teachers should uphold the students' rights to their own language.
strongly agree agree disagree strongly disagree

23. Formal grammar should be taught at all grade levels.
strongly agree agree disagree strongly disagree

Appendix B
Terry Lynn Irons

Survey Results

I. Items Directly From The Resolution

1. The claim that any one dialect is unacceptable amounts to an attempt of one social group to exert its dominance over another. (8)

Strongly Agree	63/15%	Strongly Disagree	26/6%
Somewhat Agree	192/46%	Somewhat Disagree	133/32%
TOTAL AGREE	255/62%	TOTAL DISAGREE	159/38%

2. Teachers must have the experiences and training that will enable them to respect linguistic (language) diversity and uphold the right of students to their own language. (9)

Strongly Agree	75/18%	Strongly Disagree	17/4%
Somewhat Agree	238/57%	Somewhat Disagree	90/21%
TOTAL AGREE	313/75%	TOTAL DISAGREE	107/25%

3. A nation proud of its heritage and its cultural and racial variety will preserve its heritage of dialects. (11)

Strongly Agree	62/15%	Strongly Disagree	7/2%
Somewhat Agree	299/72%	Somewhat Disagree	48/11%
TOTAL AGREE	361/87%	TOTAL DISAGREE	55/13%

4. The idea that a standard variety of American English exists has no validity. (13)

Strongly Agree	8/2%	Strongly Disagree	49/12%
Somewhat Agree	103/25%	Somewhat Disagree	249/61%
TOTAL AGREE	111/27%	TOTAL DISAGREE	298/73%

5. The claim that one variety of language is unacceptable leads to false advice for speakers and writers. (15)

Strongly Agree	15/4%	Strongly Disagree	11/3%
Somewhat Agree	229/58%	Somewhat Disagree	139/35%
TOTAL AGREE	244/62%	TOTAL DISAGREE	150/38%

6. Students should be able to use a variety of language in which they use their own identity and style. (19)

Strongly Agree	35/8%	Strongly Disagree	10/2%
Somewhat Agree	252/62%	Somewhat Disagree	115/28%
TOTAL AGREE	287/70%	TOTAL DISAGREE	125/30%

7. Teachers should uphold the students' rights to their own language. (22)

Strongly Agree	28/7%	Strongly Disagree	11/3%
Somewhat Agree	256/62%	Somewhat Disagree	117/28%
TOTAL AGREE	284/69%	TOTAL DISAGREE	128/31%

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

II. Items Implicit In The Resolution

8. Students should be able to use in school the variety of language they grow up speaking at home. (6)

Strongly Agree	23/5%	Strongly Disagree	29/7%
Somewhat Agree	188/45%	Somewhat Disagree	180/43%
TOTAL AGREE	211/50%	TOTAL DISAGREE	209/50%

9. Students should be able to speak their home language in the classroom. (12)

Strongly Agree	11/3%	Strongly Disagree	30/7%
Somewhat Agree	173/42%	Somewhat Disagree	198/48%
TOTAL AGREE	184/45%	TOTAL DISAGREE	228/55%

10. Students should be able to write in their home language in the classroom. (14)

Strongly Agree	8/2%	Strongly Disagree	43/10%
Somewhat Agree	102/25%	Somewhat Disagree	258/63%
TOTAL AGREE	110/27%	TOTAL DISAGREE	301/73%

III. Items Concerning Standard English And Pedagogy

11. One function of the schools is to teach Standard English. (7)

Strongly Agree	170/40%	Strongly Disagree	0/0%
Somewhat Agree	235/56%	Somewhat Disagree	16/4%
TOTAL AGREE	405/96%	TOTAL DISAGREE	16/4%

12. Writing that is Standard English should be evaluated higher than writing done in other varieties. (10)

Strongly Agree	37/9%	Strongly Disagree	25/6%
Somewhat Agree	140/34%	Somewhat Disagree	208/51%
TOTAL AGREE	177/43%	TOTAL DISAGREE	233/57%

13. Standard English is the best variety of English for use in the classroom. (16)

Strongly Agree	61/15%	Strongly Disagree	1/.25%
Somewhat Agree	292/71%	Somewhat Disagree	58/14%
TOTAL AGREE	353/86%	TOTAL DISAGREE	59/14%

14. My children would be best served by using both Standard English and their home language in the classroom. (17)

Strongly Agree	48/12%	Strongly Disagree	18/4%
Somewhat Agree	207/51%	Somewhat Disagree	134/33%
TOTAL AGREE	255/63%	TOTAL DISAGREE	152/37%

15. Instruction in formal grammar is the best way for students to learn Standard English. (18)

Strongly Agree	56/14%	Strongly Disagree	10/2%
Somewhat Agree	229/55%	Somewhat Disagree	120/29%
TOTAL AGREE	285/69%	TOTAL DISAGREE	130/31%

16. Students should always be required to follow guidelines of Standard English in writing. (20)

Strongly Agree	45/11%	Strongly Disagree	11/3%
Somewhat Agree	207/51%	Somewhat Disagree	145/35%
TOTAL AGREE	252/62%	TOTAL DISAGREE	156/38%

17. My children would best be served by using only Standard English in the classroom. (21)

Strongly Agree	26/7%	Strongly Disagree	18/4%
Somewhat Agree	163/40%	Somewhat Disagree	199/49%
TOTAL AGREE	189/47%	TOTAL DISAGREE	217/53%

18. Formal grammar should be taught at all grade levels. (23)

Strongly Agree	96/23%	Strongly Disagree	8/2%
Somewhat Agree	241/57%	Somewhat Disagree	74/18%
TOTAL AGREE	337/80%	TOTAL DISAGREE	82/20%

Grammar in the Middle: Teaching Junior High and Middle School

Janice Neuleib

A North Central evaluation in the center of America: for two days I have visited classes from K-12, but I have missed the junior high building. I visit one more class in the middle school, a sixth grade. The teacher is called out of the room, so I wander around talking to the students. One boy shows me the book he is reading and writing about. He's excited. It's a science fantasy, his favorite kind of reading. Another has a sports story that he's deep into, and the girl behind him is reading a mystery. I talk with them about their reading, trying to remember the fun of being eleven years old and having the whole school library waiting to be read. The class is eager and fun, but I have far to go before I finish the many English and French classes I'm supposed to visit, so I walk next door to the junior high.

The students are different here. They are only a year or two older, but they are bigger, more developed mentally and physically, and less innocent and eager. I walk into an English class. The teacher is a young woman I met the night before at the prerequisite North Central dinner. At dinner we had talked excitedly about horses and horse shows. I liked her. Now she is in front of the room with a grammar book in her hand. The students are sitting in tight rows, each with the workbook open to the lesson on relative pronouns. And for an hour I watch the students read answers from the book, up and down the rows, reading ahead and falling behind as turns come around. No one, certainly not the teacher, shows any enthusiasm or pleasure, certainly not any zest or interest, nothing like the eagerness I had seen across the lawn in the middle school.

I felt as if I had been given the task of sorting out one of those pictures in which one is supposed to figure out what's wrong, and the problem is both painfully obvious and subtly hidden. What else in life could possibly be as boring as that class? Working on a pre-robotics assembly line? Waiting for a friend who is late? The students in the class were getting the message, as have so many other junior high grammar students I have watched, that grammar is dull but must be suffered for a reason that no one ever explains. My own grammar experience was vastly different. I read my best friend's grammar book when I was in fifth grade and she in seventh. I loved it all and was eager to study the book when I reached seventh grade. Strangely, I don't remember the grammar instruction in seventh grade after all, but I still remember loving the grammar and that love being enhanced in Latin class a couple of years later.

Teachers' Attitudes

Such is definitely not the case with most junior high and middle school teachers. For the most part they have embraced the anti-grammar research and theory with passion and adamant confirmation. Unfortunately, they also have accepted the edicts of their schools and communities that grammar must be taught. Thus the rows of students plowing through workbooks continue to sit in schools

Janice Neulieb is on the faculty at Illinois State University, Normal, Illinois.

throughout the parts of Illinois I have visited. C.S. Lewis one said that perhaps it was because he lived in the provinces (Oxford) that he had never met anyone who read the Bible for pleasure (in response to those who say they are not Christians but read the Bible for its beauty); perhaps it is that I live in the province of the midwest that I have never met a junior high teacher who loves teaching grammar (I have met some who taught it with creativity and active learning, but even those were merely making a good thing of a bad deal). At any rate, the evidence of research done by Dr. Irene Brosnahan and me during the past five years indicates that most English teachers will not teach joyfully that which they do not love.

Research Study

For five years Dr. Brosnahan and I have been asking all future teachers in her grammar courses (and more recently in my grammar for writers course) to take the Myers-Briggs Personality Type Indicator and to keep journals indicating their experiences in learning grammar and their methods of studying and writing for the course. The results have been consistent and startling. The MBTI divides into sixteen basic personality preferences, including specific learning preferences, and into four "temperaments" of subdivisions of the sixteen. These latter groups divide into those who are traditional and linear in their approaches to learning (Sensing Judging), those who are adventurous and hands-on (Sensing Perceiving), those who are cerebral and systems oriented (Intuitive Thinking), and those who are relationship and values oriented (Intuitive Feeling).

Grades in the grammar classes consistently cluster around these learning groups. The Intuitive Thinking types tend to get A's and B's if they learn to love the subject; Sensing Judging types get B's and C's, and Sensing Perceiving types, of whom there are few in prospective English teaching, tend to get C's and D's. Almost no Sensing type earns an A in grammar, and almost no NF type earns below a B. Unfortunately, few of the NT types ever stay in teaching and nearly zero choose middle or junior high school teaching. The NF types tend to teach high school English. That leaves the Sensing Judging types teaching grammar at the most sensitive level and neither liking it nor having done well in it in college.

I would argue that NT types like me, and probably like most of us here today, create and debate grammars of all kinds because we find systems analysis as vital to our health and happiness as air to breath and science fiction novels to read. We don't ever, however, teach junior high school. If we do teach high school for a few years, we flee quickly to graduate school or the science lab. Those folks who are most inclined to like the routine and rigor of the junior high, the SJ's, are some of the least likely to be interested in the complex systems of language analysis invented by learners of a more theoretical stripe, as we are here.

The Interviews

To investigate this theory further, I interviewed students with strong preferences for the four temperaments from Dr. Brosnahan's grammar class for future teachers. In the interviews I asked the following questions:

1. What do you remember about your school grammar?
2. How do you feel about learning grammar?
3. How do you study grammar?
4. What classroom learning strategies work for you?
5. How would you teach grammar?

6. What do you think grammar is useful for?
7. Should grammar be taught to everyone?
8. Do you use grammar when you write or edit?

I interviewed eight students in all. Most were planning to teach, though one of the NT's wanted to be a rock musician rather than a teacher. I should note here that I am an INTJ and that my own responses will affect these interviews and my comments and perspective will flavor and affect what I have to say. I hope students whom I interviewed did not catch some of my more startled responses, but I have included them here.

Sensing Perceiving Students

The SP's generally answered the questions by describing traditional grammar instruction in school, being overwhelmed by the college grammar class, wanting to learn in groups in tangible ways with hands-on activities, wanting to make grammar fun when they teach themselves (no ideas on how to make grammar fun were specifically mentioned, though I asked), and saying that grammar is useful for getting things right in job interviews. Both agreed that they do not use grammatical terms to write or edit. They ended up with C's in the grammar class.

Sensing Judging Students

The SJ's were clearly strongly influenced by their experiences in Dr. Brosnahan's class. They wanted to please her and to get it "right." They too remembered traditional grammar instruction in school, often liking that instruction because they did well with the workbook activities. The two interviewees had had foreign languages and felt more confident because of that experience. They both liked grammar, one noting that grammar is the only English class she liked because she enjoyed having right and wrong answers. Other English classes had all that interpretation, but in grammar class she knew what was correct. My theoretical NT eyebrows were lifted at this comment, but I managed to look wide-eyed and interested, I think. Both liked to study with groups in class and out, and liked worksheets and exercises that they could get right. I began to wonder whether those junior high teachers I have watched who say they don't like to teach grammar in rows from workbooks were telling the whole truth. Both earned B's in the college grammar class.

Both agreed that grammar should be taught to everyone every year of school as problems arise. They also thought that grammar was useful for style and language skills and helped them to "write better." When I asked them, however, they worked as they wrote, one agreed that she always chooses what "sounds right" rather than overtly using her grammatical knowledge. The other said she uses grammatical terms to edit, labeling the parts of the sentence and reworking around her labels. Once again, I was mystified by this answer, but I smiled and wrote.

Intuitive Feeling Students

The NF's gave different kinds of responses. One didn't remember having grammar in school at all; the other had memorized definitions for tests and hadn't liked that kind of learning. Neither remembered liking grammar in school but hastened to say that they liked it now in college. They learned by creating their own sentence patterns, working with groups, and doing hands-on activities. Both said grammar was useful for sophisticated stylistic editing and for understanding other systems like BEV and "kid slang." I noted here particularly that they were the only ones who mentioned

altruistic uses for grammar learning. Neither used grammatical terms when editing their own work. Both received A/B in the class.

Intuitive Thinking Students

The NT's I interviewed both had their heads in other places. Both hated the restrictions of learning grammar and wanted more freedom to write and create on their own. Each learned "grammar" in foreign language classes and through their own reading, not in class. Both said they learned grammar by figuring it out, not by memorizing. They were the only ones to use terms that indicated analysis and problem-solving. Neither used grammar for editing, and neither wanted ever to teach it in school. Both wanted time to write and be creative themselves and did not want any kind of restrictions on themselves nor on anyone else. Neither did well in the grammar class according to Dr. Brosnahan because they did little of the work and let other interests interfere with natural ability. It was clear that they both "knew" grammar but found a class that looked toward teaching of little use or interest to them.

I was personally interested to find that I felt most in tune with the NF boy who described his grammar learning as a personal linguistic analysis. He described finding his sentence patterns and stylistic variations while going over old papers and improving his writing by a kind of meta-grammatical theorizing. He clearly did not "learn" grammar in a grammar class, but he enjoyed the class immensely because it gave him a chance to study further what he already liked and understood.

Conclusion

Observing experienced teachers, analyzing grades in grammar classes according to personality type, and talking with these prospective teachers has helped to focus the ongoing problem of grammar instruction. My observations reinforce the negative image of grammar instruction that books like Atwell's *In the Middle* are attacking and that the whole language movement has critiqued for many years now. Student grades show clearly how learning styles affect performance in grammar classes, and the interviews indicate how significantly preferences control what students learn and how they intend to teach. I sometimes see the schools in the terms that Mary McCaulley and Frank Natter describe in *Psychological Type Differences in Education*, as a great struggle between the SJ and NF types. The SJ teachers want order, tradition — translate workbooks and memorization. The NF teachers want individuality, cooperation, and creativity — translate language in action, whole language, and writing to learn. I think that grammar instruction will never "fit" everyone until we understand that these essential differences demand completely different approaches for differing students. What they learn will be different, and how they use what they learn will differ as well. Until we learn to work together to understand that the two groups simply mean completely different things when they teach "grammar," we will continue to be locked in this debate.

References

Atwell, Nancie. *In the Middle: Writing, Reading, and Learning with Adolescents*. Portsmouth: Boynton/Cook, 1987.

McCaulley, Mary, and Frank L. Natter. *Psychological Type Differences in Education*. Gainesville, FL: CAPT, 1980.

The Role of Pedagogical Grammar in English as a Second Language Instruction

John P. Milon

The field of teaching English to persons whose native language is not English was most commonly known as Applied Linguistics through the first half of the twentieth century. Currently the more common name/acronym is Teaching English as a Second Language (TESL) or Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL). Under whatever title, the discipline has always had an uneasy obsession with the teaching of grammar. During the first four decades of this century, the most commonly practiced TESL methodology was a version of what is known in foreign language teaching as the Grammar-Translation method.

The translation component has not usually been relevant in TESL because the language of instruction in TESL classes is meant to be English. In the teaching of ESL the translation component disappeared and the methodology focussed on instruction in English directly concerned with how to produce grammatical sentences in English. Explicit, direct teaching of grammatical rules was, and remains, a major component of the Grammar-Translation method as it is used to teach foreign languages and of the Grammar method as it is used to teach ESL (Richards & Rodgers, 1986).

In a typical lesson students are expected to master a very short list of vocabulary words chosen by the teacher or assigned by the text, and a small set of grammar rules which are presented in a carefully sequenced order. The assigned vocabulary are used in constructions determined by the nature of the assigned grammar rules. Students spend their time manipulating the vocabulary from that lesson and earlier ones within constructions allowed by the grammar rules from that lesson and earlier ones.

In the late thirties and early forties the influence of structural linguists transformed methodology in the field of teaching second languages, including English. The role of pedagogical grammars in ESL changed immensely. Direct teaching of grammatical rules or concepts was replaced by an inductive approach to grammar. ESL students were meant to "internalize" grammar rules by performing numerous repetitions of exercises which manipulated grammatical elements and by memorizing large chunks of "real" language in the form of dialogues (Kelly, 1969). The grammar found in the exercises and dialogues was still carefully chosen and sequenced. The order of presentation was usually claimed to be a function of difficulty — simpler grammatical rules were taught before more complex ones.

In the late fifties and early sixties the Chomskian revolution in linguistics began an era of tremendous ferment (some would say "chaos") in the then young field of ESL. ESL professionals found themselves grappling with the dilemma of how to plan for the classroom instruction of non-native speakers if it entailed teaching a grammar so abstract that only the intuitions of idealized native speakers could capture its nuances. This was further

---

Jack Milon is an Associate Professor of English as a Second Language in the Department of Curriculum and Instruction in the College of Education at the University of Nevada, Reno, where he teaches methods courses. His research interests are in the acquisition of oralcy and literacy in school among young children who do not speak English as their first language.

---

complicated by the fact that Chomsky's version of transformational-generative grammar specifically rejected the possibility of being able to present rules to language students (Chomsky, 1965). One of the rather bizarre options that was exercised was for publishers and writers to produce texts that claimed an orientation toward generative grammar while presenting exercises that involved combining so-called kernel sentences into surface structures.

Subsequent to Chomsky, Krashen and Terrell (Krashen and Terrell, 1983) among others, abandoned not only the overt teaching of grammar rules, but also the notion that grammar had to be presented for inductive absorption in a meticulously structured and sequenced manner. The materials presented in various versions of the Natural Approach advised against teaching an ESL class what the grammar rules were and advised against manipulating the language in a classroom so that particular grammar rules would be artificially highlighted. In other words, don't talk about contrary-to-fact conditionals and don't make an effort to use ten of them during a given class period.

In the past three decades many grammars rooted in the Chomskian paradigm have arisen. Most have been much more sensitive to socio-linguistic issues. One of these is Langacker's "cognitive grammar" (Langacker, 1990), which I believe holds great promise for ESL pedagogy. It has absolutely no potential for usefulness as a repertoire of prescriptions or rules which ESL teachers will be able to incorporate into their classroom instruction. There is not much chance that general principles like the following from page 118 will influence ESL instruction: "(13) Unit [A] sanctions a nonunit structure (B) as well-formed with respect to [A] to the extent that [A] is judged schematic for (B)." The illustration doesn't help.

The promise that cognitive grammar holds lies in Langacker's attempt to formalize his claim that the use of grammar is a problem solving activity that involves linguistic convention, contextualization, communicative objectives, aesthetic sensibilities and general knowledge. It is not necessary to go much deeper than that into cognitive grammar to be aware that Langacker is opening up a very different approach to grammar. The notions that grammar is a problem solving activity rather than a rule discovering one and that grammar involves aesthetic sensibilities in addition to linguistic convention open up liberating (on one reading) or frightening (on another reading) possibilities concerning the role of grammar in ESL classes. For example, Langacker specifically rejects the independence of grammar from lexicon and morphology. He claims that they "form a continuum of symbolic units, divided only arbitrarily into separate components."

What cognitive grammar represents for me is a theoretical basis to support my own teaching practice and my own convictions about the role of grammar in ESL classes. Cognitive grammar holds out the promise inherent in a concept of grammar which is not restricted to being an autonomous set of directives separated from the social context within which they are effective. Cognitive grammar seems to be making the claim that a grammar must be responsive to the social context within which grammatical constructs are used. To me this means that it is pointless to either teach the grammar of a piece of language directly or to present it in any pre-structured or pre-organized way until we are sure that the student understands the social context within which the piece of language is being used.

Langacker's arguments and those of other linguists like Fauconnier (1985) provide a principled theoretical rationale for not teaching grammar until late in the ESL program, if, in fact, it is taught at all. I would argue that if the implications of cognitive grammar are carried through, there would be

little purpose or interest in either the explicit teaching of grammar rules or the presentation of clumps of text containing numerous examples of particular grammar rules.

One of the implications of cognitive grammar seems to me to be that it simply does not make sense to talk about one's grammatical competence or grammatical ability outside of a social context. It would be impossible to teach grammar as self-contained independent entity separate from the social context in which it is used. The simple act of linking grammar into the social context would appear to explain many otherwise problematic features of grammar use among non-native speakers.

Why do many Ilocano speakers for example continue to "confuse" the masculine and feminine forms of personal pronouns long after they are able to speak excellent English? Some appear to switch almost randomly between *he* and *she* when referring to a sister for example. The difficulty is obviously not an inability to distinguish gender in relatives. One explanation is rooted in the structural linguistics of half a century ago — errors occur because there is a contrast between the way the native language divides up a piece of reality (using a gender neutral pronoun) and the way English divides up a piece of reality (both gender specific and gender neutral pronouns). Perhaps the difficulty lies in the social context rather than the grammatical formalisms. One suggestion for the cause of the apparent gender confusion that Ilocano speakers exhibit when they learn English is that the speaker was taught the difference among the forms on the basis of grammatical structures rather than on the basis of social relationships.

This analysis helps to explain the difficulty that some learners of English as a second language have in mastering apparently simple forms such as the distinction between "a rock pile" (which is synonymous with "a pile of rock") and "a bridge table" (which is definitely not synonymous with "a table of bridge"). These forms are sometimes explained as false analogies, but that explanation appears to beg the question. They cannot be mastered until the learner has the specific social experiences necessary to understand, contextualize, and deconstruct the process of playing bridge.

Langacker's "cognitive grammar" can be of some use to ESL people if it convinces us that the lexical items are not merely complicated entities or lists of characteristics to be plugged in where they fit but constructs whose control requires profound sociolinguistic and psycholinguistic knowledge as well as extensive experience in the culture of the language. The same can be said of the syntactic component. It is not just a collection of rather complicated rules about the arrangement of lexical items. It is rooted in detailed knowledge about socially appropriate behavior in different kinds of speech communities.

Often the layman's perception of language and language learning is that people who can use a language are people who have a collection of words that they know the meanings of and a list of rules for putting that list of words into appropriate patterns. Knowing the language means knowing how to put those words into patterns. It is a perception that is clearly erroneous. It cannot account for the simplest kinds of language use — e.g., the fact that *yes* often means *no* and vice versa. So in response to husband's "Did you turn the headlights off this time?", wife's "No, I left them on so the battery would run down again," actually means something like, "Yes, of course. And I am angry that you treat me like an idiot." There are those who would argue that such metaphorical use of language is peripheral, but I agree with Fauconnier (1985) that this kind of language is at the heart of the socially interactive and communicative use of language.

No one who educates prospective ESL teachers, as I do, would seriously object to those prospective teachers being in possession of detailed knowledge about the grammar of English. I certainly wouldn't, and I probably have a more radical view of the need for grammatical knowledge among ESL teachers than most mainstream ESL professionals have. As long as they don't attempt to teach whatever version of grammar they think they use to write and speak coherently to their students, I have no objection to ESL teachers studying English grammar. At this point I would object to them attempting to teach "it" to their students in the ESL classroom for two reasons. First, because I am not convinced that they have coherent knowledge about what grammar is — since I am convinced that linguists are uncertain about what grammar is. Second, because I am not convinced that either overtly teaching grammar or manipulating and structuring presentations of examples of grammar are going to improve the likelihood of oral fluency or literacy among ESL students.

I also have no objection to non-native speakers of English learning, acquiring, memorizing, or internalizing grammar — as long as they do it on their own time. It is important to distinguish between not wanting people to know how to produce grammatical language and not wanting to buy into a particular teaching and learning theory. I want my students to write grammatical sentences and I want them to be able to recognize ungrammatical sentences in their own rough drafts as well as in the work of others. The issue is not a choice between those who want their students to produce grammatical sentences and those who want them to produce ungrammatical sentences. It isn't even a choice between those who demand grammatical sentences and those who will accept authentic communication in whatever grammatical form it arrives. The real issue is attempting to discover what it is we as teachers can do to help ESL students speak and write grammatically. That problem does not have a simple solution.

References

Chomsky, N. 1965. *Aspects of the theory of syntax.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Fauconnier, G. 1985. *Mental spaces: Aspects of meaning construction in natural language.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Kelly, L.G. 1969. *25 centuries of language teaching.* Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Krashen, S. D., and T.D. Terrell. 1983. *The natural approach: language acquisition in the classroom.* Oxford: Pergamon.

Langacker, R.W. 1990. *Concept, image and symbol: The cognitive basis of grammar.* New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Richards, J.C. & T.S. Rodgers. 1986. *Approaches and methods in language teaching: A description and analysis.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Unplugging Drill and Practice: Alternatives for Teaching Style, Fluency, and Grammar

Neal Lerner

In the Fray

For my students, developmental writers in community college, the notion of writing as a process has seemingly passed them by. After all, the argument goes, these students need to "master" the basics before they can get doses of the good stuff: invention, play with language, academic tasks of definition, analysis and synthesis. Yet, as Mike Rose and Mina Shaughnessy, among others, have pointed out, this model of spotting and correcting student errors ignores students' academic, social, and cognitive potential. It is instead "scaling down our expectations, ...training to do the minimum, the minimum here being a simple workbook sentence free of error" (Rose, 1989, p. 141). The result is noted by Shaughnessy (1977): "So absolute is the importance of error in the minds of many writers that 'good writing' to them means 'correct writing,' nothing more" (p. 8).

To understand my students' limitations with writing mechanically correct prose is to get a sense of how few literate experiences they've had. Instead of supplying a rich language environment, their school masters have scratched their heads and decided a "back to the basics" approach would simplify matters. Most of the grammar work my students have been exposed to has consisted of workbook exercises—circle the subject and underline the verb. As Calkins and others (e.g., D'Eloia, 1981; Hartwell, 1985; Rose, 1983, 1985; Shaughnessy, 1977) have shown, this has little impact on students' writing. If anything, the time spent in "drill and practice" is time not devoted to writing. In this "traditional" model of grammar instruction, when we remind students a sentence should contain a complete thought and that multiple complete thoughts can't be stuck together without some sort of connector, they nod and take another look, but little gets translated to their writing. Yet how can we expect them to identify complete thoughts when they've had little practice in creating them, when their sentence "consciousness" is barely formed?

To create a sentence consciousness for my students, I use a variety of sentence work: expansion, modeling, and patterning. Terminology is minimized, creation and play with language emphasized. When students are exposed to these activities, they are adding more tools to their writer's toolbox, developing what Hartwell (1985) describes as "metalinguistic awareness," which "involves active manipulation of language with conscious attention to surface form" (p. 125). Additionally, by sharing this work in small groups, students see each other as creators of language, an important step toward mastery. The result is a model which "places language, at all levels, at the center of the curriculum...as literal stuff, verbal clay, to be molded and probed, shaped and reshaped, and, above all, enjoyed" (Hartwell, 1985, p. 125).

Neal Lerner is a doctoral student in Language, Literacy, and Cultural Studies at Boston University's School of Education. He also teaches creative writing, composition, and business writing in the Boston area.

What follows are three activities to build sentence consciousness. Each activity involves freewriting which could be developed into a finished piece. After each is a brief sketch of follow-up activities or additional work. Additionally, I've included examples of student work in response to these sentence activities (see Appendix A). At the next class session, I will choose a sentence or two from each student and share with the entire class, reinforcing the idea of students as creators and shapers of language.

Activities

Activity 1 — Exploring Experiences with Grammar

Rationale

- To discover in a non-threatening environment your students' experiences with grammar.
- For students to discover between classmates common experiences with the rules of spoken and written English.
- To introduce techniques of prewriting: clustering, listing, freewriting.
- To establish a reader/response atmosphere that fosters active listening and sharing.

Activities

1. Class cluster/web of the word "Grammar"; record on board or overhead.
2. Students quickly list five or six stepping stones of their experiences with grammar or the rules of language. These are instances in or out of school when grammar, language, and its rules played a significant role. One example from my experience was the time I wrote a stream-of-consciousness research paper to explore alternative styles and got a D.
3. Students choose one stepping stone and freewrite for five to 10 minutes, starting with "It was a time when...."
4. Students share freewrites with a partner, neither eliciting nor making judgments on the piece (though naturally encouraging conversation around the topic). This "silent sharing" is merely writing and reading to be heard.
5. Class sharing of three or four freewrites.

Additional Activities

- A class collaboration to define "Grammar" and "Standard Written English": This is another good way to explore students' experiences and a good activity in abstract versus concrete language. Working in small groups, students list all of the characteristics of the term, citing specific experience to support general statements. The class as a whole then judges the most important characteristics (I usually do this with a vote), justifying their choices. This class-generated definition is an excellent starting point for any study of grammar, usage, and style, and can be returned to, altered or scrapped, once the class has some experience and awareness as creators of language.
- Exploring the language and grammar of students' families: Using the "stepping stones" technique from above elicits powerful personal writing.
- Ethnographic study of a speech community to which a student does or does not belong: This is a major

project that turns students into researchers, designing an experiment, gathering data, making sense of that information, and presenting it to an audience in written and/or spoken form.

Activity 2 — Sentence Modeling

Rationale

- For students to be exposed to a variety of writing styles, some of which they will incorporate into their own style.

- For students to manipulate language according to its syntax without explicitly stating those rules. This taps into the "grammar in their heads" (Hartwell, 1985, p. 111), a knowledge of which many developmental students are rarely aware and have been led to believe they don't possess. By activating what students know about grammar and usage, you are better preparing them to create new knowledge about the English language.

Activities

1. Students choose a favorite sentence from their grammar freewrite (or any other piece), copy on a separate piece of paper, and give to partner.
2. Guide the class through an example of sentence modeling (using overhead) with a detail-packed sentence. One I often use is "The woman on the corner carefully patted her nine-inch red mohawk, straightened the iron cross around her neck, and held out a delicate, black finger-nailed thumb to catch a ride downtown." I often have the class imitate the model one word or phrase at a time, starting from the beginning of the sentence. The goal of sentence modeling is to copy the structure but not the content of the model.
3. Students model their partner's sentence from step #1, trying to copy the structure as closely as possible but changing the content.
4. Students use the sentence they created as a point of departure/first sentence for a freewrite.
5. Silent sharing of freewrites with a partner.
6. Class sharing of three or four freewrites.

Additional Activities

- A student analysis of what makes the sentences they chose for modeling their favorites: First, I have students list three or four criteria of "good sentences." After sharing these in small groups, the class then collaborates on the most important criteria (usually by voting). Mastering this academic task of defining by developing criteria and judging their relative importance is key to success in many disciplines. It also allows students to develop the criteria for good writing and effective style. I've realized that all students, no matter the level, can identify "good" sentences. Making this intuitive knowledge explicit is a great way of revealing to students the power over language they already possess.

Activity 3 — Sentence Expansion/Patterning

Rationale

- For students to learn grammatical constructions by immediately applying them in a specific way, not by memorizing abstract rules.

- For students to create the content used to study grammar. This is also a prewriting activity.

- For students to develop their powers of description, seeing multiple perspectives of a single source through collaborative learning.

Activities

1. Pairs write six simple sentences (or fewer) to describe a photograph (one photo/pair).
2. Pairs pass their simple sentences to another pair.
3. Show examples (on overhead) of simple sentences expanded with specific modifiers (see Appendix B). This step is a good opportunity to point out relevant punctuation rules.
4. Pairs expand their given sentences one at a time with example modifiers (a different modifier for each sentence).
5. After six expansions, students give sentences back to original pair who each freewrites on the photo, using the expanded sentences as points of departure.
6. Partners share freewrites with each other.
7. Class sharing of three or four freewrites.
8. Pairs identify constructions used in their partner's freewrite.

Additional Activities

- Expand freewrite into descriptive piece of the photograph or an essay or story triggered by the photograph.

And In The End

Colleagues have told me, "I'm going to drill on parts of speech this semester; I learned grammar that way." This tendency is particularly strong in developmental English, where our frustration over students' repeated mechanical errors is a barrier to teaching. Every semester we order a new load of examination copies of grammar books. "New and improved," they all say, "A fool proof method to teach basic skills." And every semester, when it comes time to decide who will go on to the next level and who will need to repeat our non-credit, low status course, we wring our hands and cast our eyes around for a better way to reach those we haven't yet reached. What I offer here is certainly no panacea. However, it is a beginning, a reminder to look at our students not as deficiencies to be remedied, but instead as language users with complicated experiences deserving recognition.

References

Calkins, Lucy M. (1986). *The Art of Teaching Writing*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

D'Eloia, Sarah. (1981). The Uses–and Limits–of Grammar. In G. Tate & E.P.J. Corbett. (Eds.). *The Writing Teacher's Sourcebook*. (pp. 225-243). New York: Oxford University Press.

Hartwell, Patrick. (1985). Grammar, Grammars, and the Teaching of Grammar. *College English, 47*, 105-127.

Rose, Mike. (1983). Remedial Writing Courses: A Critique and a Proposal. *College English, 45*, 109-128.

---. (1985). The Language of Exclusion: Writing Instruction at the University. *College English, 47*, 341-359.

---. (1989). *Lives on the Boundary.* New York: Penguin.

Shaughnessy, Mina P. (1977). *Errors and Expectations.* New York: Oxford University Press.

---. (1981). Diving in: An Introduction to Basic Writing. In G. Tate and E.P.J. Corbett (Eds.). *The Writing Teacher's Sourcebook.* (pp. 62-68). New York: Oxford University Press.

Appendix A
Neal Lerner

Student Examples

Sentence Modeling

Model: The woman on the corner carefully patted her nine-inch red mohawk, straightened the iron cross around her neck, and held out a delicate, black finger-nailed thumb to catch a ride downtown.

Imitation: The old lady sat on the curb, slowly rubbed her twenty-four inch wooden leg, bent the safety cord across her foot, and lifted herself up carefully to get a bus ride to the nearest cabinet shop.

Model: We talked about exclamation marks.

Imitation plus freewrite: They worried over chicken soup. It had been boiling for days. The once plump fryer parts were little more than liquid. The carrots, turnips, and celery were transparent. Yet was it ready? This was their first experiment with chicken soup. His mother had given them explicit directions. Everything except cooking time. Now she was out of town playing in an amateur golf tournament on Kauai. Very remote. No phones. So they watched the pot and worried. Guests would be arriving soon.

Sentence Expansion

Six simple sentences describing a photograph:

1) Steam rises from the sidewalk.
2) A man sleeps inside a cardboard box.
3) The sleeping man wears sneakers.
4) Another man walks by.
5) The passerby carries a newspaper.
6) The pavement is cold and hard.

Simple sentences each expanded with given modifiers:

1) The hot steam rises from the hard and cold sidewalk.
2) A man sleeps inside a cardboard box, and he dreams about a nice warm bed.
3) The sleeping man wears sneakers because he has cold feet.
4) Another man who is in a rush to get to work walks by.
5) The passerby, thinking about being late to work, carries a newspaper.
6) The pavement on my street is cold in the winter and hard.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Paragraph using the expanded sentences:

The pavement on my street is cold in the winter and hard, but there are people who sleep inside cardboard boxes and dream about a nice warm bed. I saw a man who was sleeping wearing falling-a-part sneakers because it was cold outside. To get warmer, he slept by the hot steam that rose from the ground to the hard and cold sidewalk. Another man who was in a rush to get to work walked by thinking about being late and carrying a newspaper.

Appendix B
Neal Lerner

Sentence Expansion Example Modifiers

Sentence Expansion 1

Expand with single words: nouns, adjectives, adverbs.

Example 1

simple: The girl played the piano.

expanded: The skinny girl poorly played the shiny black piano.

Example 2

simple: Antonia wishes for peace.

expanded: Small Antonia deeply wishes for world peace.

Sentence Expansion 2

Expand with a comma, a joining word (for, and, nor, but, or, yet, so) and an independent clause.

Example 1:

simple: The girl played the piano.

expanded: The girl played the piano, yet she had never taken a lesson.

Example 2:

simple: Antonia wishes for peace.

expanded: I can't remember the reason why I fight, but Antonia wishes for peace.

Sentence Expansion 3

Expand with a connecting word (e.g., because, since, when, if, while) and a dependent clause.

Example 1:

simple: The girl played the piano.

expanded: Because she felt like it, the girl played the piano when the moon was full.

Example 2:

simple: Antonia wishes for peace.

expanded: Antonia wishes for peace because her ears are sore from her parents' fighting.

Sentence Expansion 4

Expand with relative clauses.

Example 1:

simple: The girl played the piano.

expanded: The girl who claimed to be my sister played the piano that sat in the living room.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Example 2:

simple: Antonia wishes for peace.

expanded: Antonia, who had not yet learned to tie her shoes, wishes for peace which will allow her to sleep better.

Sentence Expansion 5

Expand with prepositional phrases.

Example 1:

simple: The girl played the piano.

expanded: In the late afternoon sun the girl from the bad side of town played the piano in the living room.

Example 2:

simple: Antonia wishes for peace.

expanded: Despite her angry feelings, Antonia, in a fit of composure, wishes for peace with a shake of her classmate's hand.

Sentence Expansion 6

Expand with present participial ("-ing") phrases.

Example 1:

simple: The girl played the piano.

expanded: The girl, laughing over her mistakes, played the piano sitting in the living room.

Example 2:

simple: Antonia wishes for peace.

expanded: Thinking herself foolish, Antonia, sitting beneath the oak tree, wishes for peace, covering her ears with her palms.

The 4th Annual Conference of the Association for the Teaching of English Grammar

June 25 and 26, 1993

Addresses of Presenters

Brosnahan, Irene*
University of Illinois
400 Augustine Way
Normal, IL 61761

Hunter, Alyce
413 Dervin Lane
Glen Gardner, NJ 08826

Irons, Terry Lynn
Morehead State University
150 University Blvd. - UPO 604
Morehead, KY 40351

Kenkel, James
Dept. of English
217 Wallace Building
Eastern Kentucky University
Richmond, KY 40475

Lerner, Neal
452 Park Drive, #7
Boston, MA 02215

Lesher, Tina
Dept. of Communication
William Paterson College
Wayne, NJ 07470

Milon, John P.
C&I Dept./278
College of Education
University of Nevada
Reno, NV 89557

Mullinix, Bill
English Division
Prince George's Community College
301 Largo Road
Largo, MD 20772

Neuleib, Janice
Dept. of English
Illinois State University
Normal, IL 61761

Paraskevas, Cornelia
Western Oregon State College
Dept. of English/HSS 303
Monmouth, OR 97301

Pollachek, Ellin Ronee
525 East 83rd St.
New York, NY 10028

Van Goor, Wanda
English Division
Prince George's Community College
301 Largo Road
Largo, MD 20772

Voda, Mary Beth
Wyalusing High School
R.R. 2, Box 302
Wyalusing, PA 18853

Whiting, Melissa
English Education
University of Oklahoma
1912 Twintree Drive
Norman, OK 73071

Yates, Robert
Dept. of English
Central Missouri State University
Warrensburg, MO 64093

*Didn't submit a paper for the *Proceedings*.

Addresses of ATEG Officers

Martha Kolln, President
R.D. 1 - Box 439
Bellefonte, PA 16823

George Oliver, Vice-President
English Dept./Writing Programs
South Campus Surge Bldg. 3119E
University of Maryland
College Park, MD 20742

Ed Vavra, Treasurer
Penn College of Technology
One College Avenue
Williamsport, PA 17701-5799

Mary Hall, Secretary
417 W. Walnut St.
Titusville, PA 16354